### UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

+ + + + +

#### FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

+ + + + +

#### CONSUMER ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

+ + + + +

# FRIDAY FEBRUARY 24, 2012

+ + + + +

The Advisory Committee met in the Commission Meeting Room, 445 12th Street, S.W., Washington, D.C., at 9:00 a.m., Debra Berlyn, CAC Chairperson, presiding.

#### PRESENT:

DEBRA BERLYN, Chairperson
CHRIS BAKER, AARP
ED BARTHOLME, Call for Action
INDRA CHALK, T-Mobile USA, Inc.
RICK CHESSEN, National Cable and
Telecommunications Association
MARY CRESPY, Verizon Communications, Inc.
MARK DEFALCO, Appalachian Regional
Commission
AMALIA DELONEY, Center for Media Justice
MATT FRIEDMAN, T-Mobile, USA, Inc.

America
MITSUKO HERRERA, Montgomery County, MD,
Office of Cable and Broadband Services
JULIE KEARNEY, Consumer Electronics

LISE HAMLIN, Hearing Loss Association of

JULIE KEARNEY, Consumer Electronics Association

CECILIA GARCIA, Benton Foundation

RAJA KUSHALNAGAR, Rochester Institute of Technology

# PRESENT (Cont'd):

REBECCA LADEW, Speech Communication Assistance by Telephone, Inc.

FERNANDO R. LAGUARDA, Time Warner Cable IRENE E. LEECH, Consumer Federation of America

CLAYTON LEWIS, Coleman Institute for Cognitive Disabilities

MIA MARTINEZ, National Asian American Coalition

KEN McELDOWNEY, Consumer Action

TRACI MORRIS, Native Public Media

ART NEILL, Utility Consumers' Action Network JOEL OXLEY, National Association of

Broadcasters

STEPHEN POCIASK, American Consumer Institute STEPHANIE PODEY, National Cable and Telecommunication Association

ANDREA QUIJADA, Media Literacy Project
PAUL SCHROEDER, American Foundation for the
Blind

CLAUDE STOUT, Deaf and Hard of Hearing Consumer Advocacy Network

BARRY UMANSKY, Digital Policy Institute
DOROTHY WALT, Helen Keller National Center
for Deaf-Blind Youth and Adults
OLIVIA WEIN, National Consumer Law Center
KRISTA WITANOWSKI, CTIA The Wireless

Association

## ALSO PRESENT:

SCOTT MARSHALL, Designated Federal Official KRIS MONTEITH, Acting Bureau Chief, FCC WILLIAM FREEDMAN, Deputy Bureau Chief, Consumer and Governmental Affairs Bureau JOSH GOTTHEIMER, Senior Counsel, Office of the Chairman

KAREN PELTZ STRAUSS, Deputy Bureau Chief, Consumer and Governmental Affairs Bureau KIM SCARDINO, Deputy Chief,

Telecommunications Access Policy Division MARK STONE, Deputy Bureau Chief, Consumer and Governmental Affairs Bureau

# C-O-N-T-E-N-T-S

Welcome & Call to Order	Page 4
Self-Introductions	4
Bureau Update	9
Update on National Broadband Plan Implementation	52
Update on Recent Report & Order and Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking on Lifeline Link-up Reform/Modernization	90 on
Update from Disability Rights Office	120
Roundtable Discussion on Emerging Consumer Issues	146
Working Group Breakout Sessions	
Reaffirmation of Recommendation from November 4, 2011, Meeting	192
Report Back Media Working Group	196
Report Back & Recommendations of USF Working Group	202
Report Back Consumer Empowerment Working Group	211
Report Back & Recommendation of Broadband Working Group	222
Report Back Disability Working Group	228
Comments from the Public	238
Wrap-up and Next meeting	240

# P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S

9:12 a.m.

CHAIR BERLYN: Welcome, everyone.

Good morning. I am Debra Berlyn, CAC Chairperson, representing the National Consumers League. I want to welcome everyone this morning. So glad you could make it.

We are going to go around the room and introduce ourselves. If I could, I am going to give a proper introduction to Chris Monteith in a moment after we all go around, but this is Chris Monteith, Acting Bureau Chief of Consumer and Governmental Affairs Bureau. Fernando?

MR. LAGUARDA: Good morning. Fernando Laguarda, representing Time Warner Cable.

MR. McELDOWNEY: Ken McEldowney, Consumer Action.

CHAIR BERLYN: Oh, please remember to raise your hand. Hopefully, they can catch us as we are going around the room and keep

1	those mikes live. But remember, when you want
2	to speak, you have to raise your hand so that
3	they know to turn the mike on and get it live.
4	MS. MARTINEZ: Good morning. Mia
5	Martinez with the National Asian American
6	Coalition.
7	MR. BARTHOLME: Ed Bartholme with
8	Call for Action.
9	MR. POCIASK: Steve Pociask,
10	American Consumer Institute.
11	MS. WALT: Dorothy Walt from the
12	Helen Keller National Center.
13	MR. DEFALCO: Mark Defalco, The
14	Appalachian Regional Commission.
15	MR. OXLEY: Joel Oxley, on the
16	Board of the national Association of
17	Broadcasters and with WTOP and WFED in
18	Washington.
19	MS. QUIJADA: Andrea Quijada,
20	Media Literacy Project in Albuquerque, New
21	Mexico.
22	MS. GARCIA: Cecilia Garcia,

1	Benton Foundation.
2	MS. DELONEY: Amalia Deloney,
3	Center for Media Justice.
4	DR. MORRIS: Traci Morris, Native
5	Public Media, Phoenix, Arizona.
6	MS. WITANOWSKI: Krista
7	Witanowski, CTIA, The Wireless Association.
8	MS. LEECH; Irene Leech, Consumer
9	Federation of America.
10	MR. NEILL: Art Neill, Utility
11	Consumers Action Network and its independent
12	program New Media Rights.
13	MR. STOUT: Hello. My name is
14	Claude Stout, and I am with the Deaf and Hard
15	of Hearing Consumer Advocacy Network.
16	MS. HAMLIN: Lise Hamlin from
17	Hearing Loss Association of America.
18	MS. PODEY: Stephanie Podey,
19	National Cable and Telecommunications
20	Association.
21	MR. BAKER: Chris Baker with AARP.
22	MS. CRESPY: Mary Crespy with

1	Verizon Communications.
2	MR. SCHROEDER: Paul Schroeder,
3	American Foundation for the Blind.
4	MR. UMANSKY: I am Barry Umansky
5	with the Digital Policy Institute, and also in
6	attendance today is Dr. Robert Yadon from the
7	Digital Policy Institute.
8	MR. STONE: I am Mark Stone. I am
9	a Deputy Chief in the Consumer and
LO	Governmental Affairs Bureau.
11	CHAIR BERLYN: Welcome, everyone,
12	and a special welcome to Art Neill who has
13	taken Michael Scott's place from UCAN. So,
L 4	welcome.
L5	I am going to dispense with a lot
L 6	of our announcements until a little later this
L7	morning, because we are on a very tight
L8	schedule for the next two hours, but one
L 9	special announcement I want to make.
20	I want to thank Fernando Laguarda
21	and Time Warner Cable for our meals this
22	morning for our breakfast and lunch So

thank you very much, Fernando. We very much appreciate it.

Ι make other want to one announcement. This is really exciting. are getting to the 21st Century here. For the first time, our meeting is being live Tweeted and posted on Facebook. So we will be getting some questions sent to us from the general public, and we will be able to respond to them at various points during the day. So this is to increase the participation from consumers around the country and others to be able to join us in this meeting during the day. wanted to mention that.

Now it is my great pleasure to introduce Chris. As most of you know, Joel Gurin resigned last month, and his last day was about a week or so ago. Is that right, Chris? Yes, give or take a few days.

This is Kris' first week with the Bureau, but it is not her first week with the Commission. Kris has had a long and

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

distinguished history here at the FCC, chairing the Enforcement Bureau and actually serving on the Consumer Bureau at one time as a Deputy Bureau Chief. Correct?

Actually, she has been everywhere at the FCC and has done everything. I have known Kris for many years. We are so lucky to have her as the Acting Bureau Chief. Correct? You know, we really are. We are very fortunate, and I am so pleased that she has stepped into this role, and I am very pleased here today to you are give introduction and to also introduce your staff, and they will be giving us some updates as well. So welcome, Kris.

much. Thank you for the introduction, Debra, and it is great to be reconnecting with Debbie and with many of the folks around the table.

I see many familiar faces, and for those of you that I have not had the pleasure of meeting, I look forward to working with you

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

in the days and months ahead.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

As Debbie said, it is Day Four on Thus far, I have moved the job for me. offices. I have met many new folks and reconnected with others. I have had lots of meetings. I have been briefed on new issues and important priorities for the Bureau, but I have lots to learn.

Some things I have learned already, and these things were readily apparent to me. First, the almost 200 men and women of the Bureau are committed mission, and that mission is developing and policies, implementing informed consumer including disability rights and disability accessibility policies; serving as the public face of the Commission through outreach and education; responding to consumer inquiries and complaints; and maintaining collaborative partnerships with state, local, and tribal in of overlapping governments areas jurisdiction and common interests.

D.	econa,	ciiac (	rnere	12	an e	:qua	тту
committed,	very	talen	ited,	an	nd	str	ong
leadership t	eam in	place	in t	the :	Burea	.u.	I
have brought	four	of t	the B	urea	u's	seni	ior
leaders with	n me t	oday:	Ма	rk	Stone	·, \	who
oversees the	e Burea	u's c	consum	er ]	polic	у а	and
intergovernme	ental a	affair	s fı	ıncti	ons;	B	ill
Freedman, wh	no has	resp	onsib	ility	, fo	r (	our
consumer inq	uiries	and c	ompla:	ints	func	tion	ns,
and web and p	print pu	blishi	.ng; G	eoff	Blac	kwel	11,
who I actual	ly hope	will	be jo	oinin	g us		he
has been out	sick fo	or a c	ouple	of d	days,	and	l l
don't see	him he	re at	t the	e mo	oment	, k	out
hopefully, he	e is wel	ll eno	ugh t	o at	tend	toda	ау,
and Geoff o	versees	our	Nativ	ze A	ffair	îs â	and
policy work;	and Kar	en Pel	tz St	raus	s, wh	.o ma	any
of you know,	w ho h	nas re	spons	ibili	ty f	or (	our
disability r	ights a	nd aco	cessib	oilit	y wo	rk a	and
the consumer	affairs	and o	utrea	ch fi	uncti	ons.	•

Mark, Bill and Geoff -- I hope,

Geoff -- will speak with you for a few minutes

following me, and Karen appears on your agenda

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

later in the day. They are a great team, and I am delighted to be working with them.

Together, the Bureau is also committed to the Chairman's vision of a fact based and data driven agency. We are also committed to the overall vision of openness and transparency in government.

With those goals in mind, Bill Freedman has been working tirelessly on initiative to improve our consumer complaints and inquiries function. We are striving for a experience that efficient, consumer is friendly, effective, user and with all protections for consumers' privacy, one that allows us to better understand and utilize the data we gather through the consumer complaint and inquiries process, to better inform the agency's policy making.

We could use your help. We have spoken with your Chairperson, Debbie, about this initiative, and Bill will fill you in on details in a few moments.

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

I want to stress that the CAC is important to the overall work of the Bureau and to the agency. The collective depth and breadth of your communications and consumer expertise is awesome, truly awesome. We thank you for your willingness to serve and for giving of your time and your expertise.

I look forward to working with each of you and getting to know you better. I hope that we will have many opportunities to chat and get to know each other. You know where to reach me. I am on the fifth floor. Debbie has got my contact information and my telephone number. So, certainly, when you are at the agency, stop by and say hello. I would love to, as I said, get to know you, and give me a ring at anytime.

Now I will turn it over to Mark.

MR. STONE: Hi. Thanks for giving me a couple of minutes of your time to describe some of the Bureau's recent policy work. I think you will find these areas

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

relevant to what you all what to accomplish. Gut first, thanks for the work that you have done and the work you are yet to do.

understanding of what consumers expect and need from their communication services. So very briefly, I will tell you about the recent robocalls order. In fact, that was last week that the Commission adopted it. I also want to tell you about another critical area that we are looking at in the Bureau related to cramming.

So first, robocalls: The changes adopted the Commission last week give additional protection from consumers annoying, unwanted, autodialed or pre-recorded telemarketing calls, also known as robocalls. The changes maximize consistency between the Commission's rules and the Federal Commission's analogous telemarketing requirements, as directed by the Do Not Call Implementation Act.

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

First, the Commission required telemarketers to get prior express, written, oral, consent before robocalling not consumer. In addition to conventional written consent, the Commission chose to do the eSign Act, which permits electronic alternatives to conventional writing, things like e-mail, text message, telephone key press or recorded oral Those will each facilitate that consent. consent process.

Significantly, the changes the Commission adopted will not affect the purely informational calls that consumers find useful, such as those related to school closings, usage bank fraud alerts or notifications.

Second, the Commission eliminated the "established business relationship" exception to the consent requirements for telemarketing robocalls. Under that exception, telemarketers can currently make robocalls to consumers with whom they have

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

previously done business, even when the consumer has not consented to those calls.

Third, the Commission required telemarketers to provide consumers with an automated, interactive opt-out mechanism during each robocall.

So these new requirements will gradually go into effect over the next year, but we think it is a big win for consumers.

Second, I wanted to talk about cramming, which folks around the table probably are pretty familiar with. It is something the Commission has had its eyes on for years now. For those that may not know, cramming is billing for unauthorized charges on consumer telephone bills.

In 1998, a coalition of wireline carriers recognized the issue and developed a set of industry guidelines or best practices to address the practice. Then in 1999, the Commission adopted some truth in billing rules that were designed to enable consumers to

better detect both slamming and cramming.

More recently, in July of 2011, the commission recognized that it was an ongoing problem, and sought comment on a set of proposed rules to further address cramming with a couple of methods.

The first proposal was a clear separation of third party charges on phone bills from other charges. I should note that third party charges have been the major source of cramming complaints that we have seen here and that we have heard of from organizations outside the FCC.

The second proposal that the Commission offered in July 2011 was clear disclosure of options to block those charges. So to the extent current wireline carriers offer to consumers an option to block all third party charges, that they will need to make that clear to consumers up front.

I should note that the Commission discussed the potential for cramming in the

mobile context. It did not propose specific rules for mobile. The proposed rules I just mentioned were for the wireline telephone.

On the same day as the NPRM or about the same time, the commission also issued an infographic that was designed to show how frequently consumers are affected by cramming and how often they may not realize they are being crammed.

Also in July of 2011, the Senate Commerce Committee issued a staff report on cramming, describing the effect to the consumers. So we are taking a look at that as well.

So the comment and now comment dates are coming on. We are reviewing the comments from the public, all relevant Very generally, the carriers stakeholders. oppose new rules. They argue that third party billing can help consumers and that voluntary carrier efforts to curb cramming sufficient, and that many already block third

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

party charges at consumers' request.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Also very generally, some of the states and the FTC and others say that more action is needed to address cramming. Some ideas that they have suggested include greater bill disclosure of third party billing, requiring opt-in from consumers to allow third party charges, and other possible actions.

So these are just two of larger policy initiatives we have been working on in the Bureau. I am excited to have Kris here to lead us through our agenda. continue to work on, in addition to the two I mentioned, other matters under the Telephone Consumer Protection Act and the Communications Act, and again we look forward to working with all of move forward with our you as we consumer empowerment agenda.

CHAIR BERLYN: Shall we take questions now? Ken?

MR. McELDOWNEY: Yes. Certainly, after it seems like decades, welcome the land

line cramming regulations. What steps do you think the Commission is going to be taking in terms of wireless cramming, given that that is -- replacing land lines throughout the country, in order to try and get this stopped before it really gets a foothold?

MR. STONE: That is question. I can't speak for the entire Commission, obviously, but what I suspect it will do, as we always do, is to continue to take a look at the complaints we do receive breaks by analyze how it out category, and then consider what the next appropriate steps are.

CHAIR BERLYN: Does anyone have any other questions for Mark? Thank you, Mark.

MS. MONTEITH: Now Bill Freedman will fill you in on what is going on in the consumer inquiries and complaints area. Bill also oversees our web and print publishing functions, if you have any questions in that

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

area. Bill?

MR. FREEDMAN: Good morning. My name is Bill Freedman. I am one of the three Deputies in CGB and, as Kris mentioned, I am responsible for two divisions, both of whose work falls right within the wheelhouse of this committee. So it is great to be here and see you all here this morning.

One is the Web and Print Publishing Division, which is responsible for, in part, overseeing 175 consumer guides and related information sources that we have on the Internet where people want to know about our policies and our rules, what their rights are, how they can best enjoy communication services that are offered by providers here in this country.

What I am going to talk about more today is our Consumer Inquiries and Complaints Division, which is the other division that I work with. It, obviously, handles complaints and inquiries that we receive from members of

the public. We get these inquiries and complaints via a Commission website, email, ordinary mail, Faxes and phone calls.

It is by far the largest division in CGB. It has a total of 85 employees, including 30 consumer advocacy and mediation specialists, which we call CAMS, in the Gettysburg office, and also 30 here in Washington.

Just to give you an idea of the volume of work that these CAMS take care of, in the third and fourth quarter of 2011 they responded to over 43,000 emails, nearly 102,000 phone calls, and over 135,000 complaints.

So they are very, very busy, and one of the exciting things that I am doing, as Kris mentioned, is taking a fresh look at the process by which they handle this tremendous volume of inquiries and complaints from the public and see, number one, if there is a way that we can do it more efficiently and

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

effectively but, number two, make the interface with the public a little more consumer friendly and understandable so people are invited to avail themselves of these processes and have us handle their complaints, and do it in a reasonable manner.

There are a number of functions of the complaint process and the inquiry process that I want to go over, and these functions really guide how we are looking at the process.

One is, obviously, someone writes us or calls us or emails us and asks for information about a particular commission policy and a consumer problem, like spoofing or loud commercials on television or rural phone calls that aren't completed as they should be, and the CAMS have information as well as written guides that can give people the information that they want.

The second function that the CAMS carry out is handling complaints from

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

consumers. When consumers have problems, what we often do is we listen to the complaint. We get it in writing. We serve a copy of the complaint on the carrier or the communications provider, and ask them to respond to try to work out with the consumer a resolution to the problem that is acceptable to the consumer who has complained to us.

If that doesn't work, what our CAMS often do is engage in mediation and try to act as an advocate for the consumer to work out a solution.

Something that just happened this week that is a good example of this process We had a gentleman send a complaint, that he wanted to get an iPhone, that he wanted to get one of these new Smart Phones rather than the dumb phone that he has. The communications provider originally sorry, you got to wait until the term is up; you have two years; we will be thrilled to sell you a phone at a discounted price where

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

we underwrite part of it, but we can't do it in the middle of your term.

So we talked to the consumer, and the consumer said, that is crazy, I am willing to extend the term for another two years, they are going to get more money from me; there is no reason why they shouldn't give me an iPhone.

So we went back to the carrier, and after a little head banging, the carrier came back and said, got great news for you, we will sell the complainant a discounted Smart Phone as long as it is not an iPhone. So he was less than overjoyed with this, and our relentless CAM went back to the carrier another time and said, that just doesn't work; he needs an iPhone. And Tuesday he got his iPhone.

I am not saying that we can do that kind of thing for everybody. Don't write down my name or my phone number, but that is what we try to do, and these CAMS really are

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

incredible as to what they do, because they have to know pretty much everything that we do here at the Commission, which is kind of a daunting task, and they work very, very hard to resolve these problems, and I think it is terrific that they do that.

Again, what we want to do is work with you guys to try to make this process even more effective than it already is.

The other thing that the CAMS do is they act as kind of an early warning system for the Commission, and let us know what is going out there in the marketplace where people are encountering problems. What we are able to do is alert folks here at the Commission that problems are occurring, and we can be a little more proactive in dealing with them.

A real good example of that is:
As you probably know, at the end of last year
one of the carriers announced that they were
going to charge consumers two dollars for the

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

privilege of paying their phone bills on the Internet or over the phone.

One of our CAMS, the Friday before — actually, the Thursday before New Years, took down this complaint, and I sent it up to the eighth floor, and all I can tell you is that later that day the Commission issued a strongly worded statement that we were concerned about this practice, and we were looking into it. By the end of the day, the carrier had rescinded the policy.

Now I am not saying that it was this lone CAM in Gettysburg on a frigid December morning that took this complaint and passed it on and that is why this happened, but I would like to think that the fact that these CAMS are diligently doing their jobs helps the commission protect consumers and make sure that there aren't irregularities in the marketplace that might be violative of the spirit, if not the letter, of our rules.

The last substantial function that

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

this complaint and inquiry process performs is it informs the commission as to what problems consumers are encountering on a trend basis, so that we can maybe take another look at our rules and maybe adjust them or come up with new rules, or take enforcement action or do a combination of both, again to effectively and quickly deal with problems that happen in the marketplace, which is a long, long way of saying that I am here to ask you for your help.

mentioned, of Kris one As things that we are doing is looking at this see if it can be entire process to more effective and efficient and, in part, consumer friendly. So we are looking at a of alternative interfaces number t.hat. if they want consumers can use to file complaints with the commission on the Internet or over the phone or by email or whatever.

We are getting our arms around the problems. We are going to be calling on you,

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

if you will, to take a look at what we are coming up with, and make sure that it doesn't smack too much of bureaucrat-speak, and whether it is actually understandable English that real people can understand and use to their benefit.

We are also taking a look at the way our CAMS process these complaints, whether it makes sense for CAMS to specialize particular substantive areas. We are also looking at how they compile the data that they receive from complaints and inquiries. will be talking to the various bureaus the various offices of talking to the Commission and asking them, what kind of data do you really need; what areas are you really looking into; how can we best break down the get so that it serves data that we purposes?

So that is a long, long commercial to say that we appreciate everything that you all do, and we will be calling on you soon,

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	and I look forward to working with all of you.
2	Thank you.
3	CHAIR BERLYN: Thank you, Bill.
4	We have Oh, Bill, do you want to stay for a
5	moment? Looks like there are questions.
6	MR. FREEDMAN: I have a truck in
7	the front. Go ahead. Oh, I'm sorry.
8	CHAIR BERLYN: Remember, the way
9	we do this is lift your tent card up. It is a
10	way to keep me organized here, if you have
11	questions. So Chris, Paul and Ken and, I
12	think and Lise. That is probably all the
13	time we are going to have for questions. We
14	might even get that far, but let's give it a
15	shot. Chris?
16	MR. BAKER: Chris Baker.
17	CHAIR BERLYN: And keep your cards
18	up.
19	MR. BAKER: Chris Baker with AARP.
20	In the introductions, I neglected to
21	introduce my colleague Coralette Hannan, who
22	is sitting behind us. Sorry about that.

CHAIR BERLYN: Coralette.

MR. BAKER: In our discussions in working groups, we have talked about the new website. I am curious as to how the new website and the link to the old website —what impact is that having on complaints or are more people seeing it or not, or if you see any trends.

MR. FREEDMAN: Well, I should say that one of Web and Print Publishing's primary functions is to work with our IT people here at the Commission to try to make the new website as user friendly as possible. As with anything else that is so radically changed, there have been some glitches.

We rolled out last month something known as My FCC that allows people to customize what they get to fall within the areas that they are concerned about. As far as the complaint process, one of the synergies of my working with both of these divisions is I am working with Web and Print Publishing as

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

well to make sure, again, that our complaint process is transparent and usable to consumers as possible. So that will continue. Thank you.

CHAIR BERLYN: Let me just also mention, the website is a tool that we are very interested in. We did ask to have someone come specifically and talk about the the design and redesign website, and the updating of it. We didn't get someone for this meeting, but we expect to have someone come and talk about it at our next meeting. about that later, but We talk that something, Bill, that we are really interested in, because we see that as an information tool, as an outreach tool, and here also, as Chris mentioned, it is probably something that helps connect consumers to the complaint process as well. So, good question. Paul?

MR. SCHROEDER: Hi. Paul Schroeder, AFB, Foundation for the Blind.

Just a couple of quick things.

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

I want to make sure that -- and we can talk about this separately -- that there is opportunities to make sure that consumers, particularly someone with vision loss, know how to contact the complaint center, including on issues not related to disability but on all the host of other consumer issues that, of course, they might be interested in. So we will want to maybe work with you separately on how to make sure that kind of information is being made available to consumers, which kind of gets to one of my points.

I have three quick questions:

Awareness: How do consumers know about the complaint center, if you could briefly touch on that.

Issues that you are surprised are not covered or that -- You mentioned ones that emerge from the complaints, but I am wondering if there are ones, as you look through the numbers, that you are surprised aren't coming through; and if so, are there steps to try to

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

deal with that?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Then the third I guess question would be: The that ones are disability issue related complaints, into the center. that come How are those handled?

MR. FREEDMAN: As far as new areas of concern, one of the things that we are doing as we are taking a fresh look at this complaint process is how the process by which we receive complaints can be more agile to deal with either new issues that arise under our existing rules, things like spoofing and difficulties with people getting long distance calls in rural areas, as well as new areas that we are regulating as the laws change, things like loud commercials, CableCards, open Internet principles, things like that.

The problem is that we have dropdown menus by which people file their complaints, and sometimes it is hard to shoehorn a new area into one of those existing

drop-down menus.

So we are working very closely with our IT people to come up with ways where we can sort of shift on a dime, if all of a sudden problems with rural calls break out in Nebraska or something like that, so we can deal with those problems.

As far as complaints from the disabled community, we do have folks in Gettysburg and in Washington who can handle those types of complaints. One of the things we are looking at, again, is how to handle those more efficiently and effectively, and I look forward to working with you, Paul, to come up with some solutions.

CHAIR BERLYN: Ken.

MR. McELDOWNEY: I am Ken McEldowney. Talking about consumer action, I think one of the things that I have been hemming at over the years and, hopefully, there will be a difference now, has been the inabilities of the Commission to basically

serve folks for whom English is not the primary language.

I remember out of earlier CAT, I was told that there was a blind woman who spoke Spanish, but unfortunately she was on maternity leave. I guess what I wanted to know is a couple of things.

What is the breakdown in terms of your complaint handling staff in terms of being bilingual, and what languages are served? How are you talking to consumers for whom English is not the primary language in terms of how to file complaints, and sort of what education materials do you have that sort of alert folks who do not speak English about their rights and how to complain?

Action has Consumer had bilingual complaint line with which we serve consumers in English, Spanish, Cantonese and Mandarin for probably two decades, and the information in terms of how to get complaints how to reach us in those and

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

languages is on all the materials that we distribute, about a million a year.

As an indication of the problem, we recently, on our Chinese hotline, learned massive in about scam San Francisco Chinatown in which people were purporting to represent AT&T, having people come in, order multiple cellphones, SmartPhones, telling them not to open the boxes and to bring them back to them. The company then would resell it to get some media in language press. We received some 80 complaints.

None of those people knew how to reach the FCC, none of them; only could come to us for assistance, and we worked with AT&T in terms of resolving that complaint. I mean those complaints and rolling those back.

Again, I would really like to work with you in terms of trying to see exactly what you are doing in terms of tracking complaints by language and seeing whether or not that represents -- that that breakdown is

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

very similar to the breakdown within the country itself.

MR. FREEDMAN: I can tell you that this Commission in particular is very sensitive to making our complaint and inquiry process as all inclusive as possible. to that end, within the last six months our Web and Print Publishing Division translated virtually all of our consumer guides into Spanish.

I know that there are some other languages that might need translating, too, and we are looking into that and, when I am done, I would like to trade contact information to work with you on this.

I know that we do have folks in our Consumer Centers who are definitely Spanish speaking, and I believe we have folks who are accessible to translate complaints into other areas. We want to do more in this, and again I would like to work with you on that.

MR. McELDOWNEY: Yes. We have

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

been translating all our materials into the five languages for probably 15 years. I think the breakdown is probably sort of informative. Probably in the course of a year, probably 30 percent -- We distribute our material to a national network of some 7,000 groups, and they order materials from us free and in bulk.

About 30 percent of the publications that we ship out are in Spanish, and probably, again, five to 10 percent in Chinese, in both Chinese, Korea and also in Vietnamese.

CHAIR BERLYN: I am going to move to Lise next but, you know, the number of cards that have popped up, Bill, has made me realize that at our next meeting we are going to plan a one-on-one with Bill, because I think that you, obviously, have a set of issues that the CAC is really interested in. So I think we want to dedicate some more time at our next meeting to a dialogue with you and talk about some of these issues in greater

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

depth. Lise, you are next.

MS. HAMLIN: Lise Hamlin from Hearing Loss Association of America, and I am really glad to hear Debra say that, because there is a lot, and I don't want to take up too much time now, but just quickly.

I think Ken hit on something that is not just true with people who speak other languages, but also people with disabilities. They don't know who to complain to. They don't know to come to the FCC for an issue.

I even had somebody who had an iPhone, can't hear on it or use it. I said, did you file a complaint, and he said, no. So I look at your list of complaints. I saw the recent report, and people with disabilities is this little tiny portion of it, which makes you think, oh, everything is okay, right?

Everything is not okay. So I think one of the things that we need -- How I would like to work with you is trying to find of how do we get that information out to the

consumers? You don't want complaints about things out in left field, but you do want to hear about the things that the FCC can actually do something about.

So that was one thing, and whether we can work with you on surveying or whatever we can do to reach out to the community, we would like to work with you on that.

So if you have plans already in your mind about what we can do to help you, I would like to find a way to be involved in that.

Then I think these consumer -- I love, actually, the fact sheets. I love getting those and being able to send them out, but we need more ways that the consumers know that these sheets are out there, that they can get this information. Just more public awareness, I think, would help us help you.

MR. FREEDMAN: Well, one of the things that we are doing with Web and Print Publishing is, again, trying to tweak the new

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

FCC website to make it as user friendly as possible. So if somebody wants to know about cramming, they can put the word cramming in, everything will appear before substantial number because have а we information sheets out there, and it is a question of hooking up the people with the sheets that they need, and we are trying to this in as reasonable and logical and user friendly a way as possible.

MS. HAMLIN: If I could just add one more thing real quickly, it is that the other thing that we find is a lot of our people have complaints about television, access to television and captioning, that kind of thing. But when you go -- It is really not an easy process. It is a barrier, the forms that are used now.

I find them easy, because I have used them a lot, but I have heard from my people that they find it hard to use. The other piece is that you are sitting and

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

watching television, and your kicked back. You don't want to have to spend the time complaining.

So there may be an easier way to do it like shooting out an email and saying I am having a problem now, here is my problem, instead of having to go through the whole, okay, now I got to go to the Internet and fill out this whole form, and find it.

There may be -- That is another area, I think, that we need to look at, how those forms work and the interface with actual people.

MR. FREEDMAN: Well, one of the things we are doing, as I mentioned -- I don't want to take up this whole meeting, but one of the things that we are doing in looking at this whole process is not only complaints but also consumer inquiries where people do just that. They call up and they say, I am having a problem with this, what are my rights.

One of the things that we are

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

trying to do is true up the scripts and the information that are available to our CAMS to handle those types of questions with the information sheets that are prepared, to make sure that what the CAMS are telling people and what the information sheets say are in synch and also are as up to date as possible.

As you can imagine, there is a lot of information that we have to cover, and one of the things that we are looking at is a way to involve each of the licensing bureaus and operational bureaus that have particular expertise in particular areas to get them involved in this process to proactively update our information base, again with the objective of getting it to people as efficiently as possible.

Here is Karen. I was just going to give her a plug.

MS. PELTZ STRAUSS: I just wanted to mention that, if anybody does have a captioning complaint, they can always send an

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

email to our DRO mailbox. I believe it is dro@fcc.gov, and I will confirm later when I come down.

If we have concerns about filling out the form, we have people that can help with it, and no one should not file a

7 complaint, because they are having trouble

8 with the form. They can let us know, and we

have people that can help them.

CHAIR BERLYN: Thanks, Karen.

MR. FREEDMAN: I will close and just say thank you again for all of your interest and all of your enthusiasm, and I look forward to working with everyone of you. Thank you.

CHAIR BERLYN: Thank you, Bill.
Thank you very much. Kris, anything?

MS. MONTEITH: I apologize. Geoff Blackwell, who heads up our Native Affairs and Policy Office, is out sick today, but generally, Geoff's shop has been instrumental in working with other bureaus and offices to

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

make sure that, as we make policy decisions, that the interests of native nations are also front and center in that policy making.

He has also worked very hard to go out to visit native nations and to bring, again, information where it is needed, and to work with native nations to address their concerns. It is a community that has been historically underserved, and we want to change that.

So he will be available later in the day, if there is any time on your agenda. I think he is coming into the office later, but just wasn't -- He has been out sick a couple of days. So wasn't feeling up to it this morning. We can also put him on your agenda, assuming that is fine with Debbie, for another meeting.

Again just in closing, I really appreciate -- We, the Bureau, the agency, really appreciates all your time and your energies. It sounds like we have hit upon

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

some issues that are ripe for discussion and really digging in, and we would love to use you as -- Obviously, you are an asset. You are a resource. We would love to get the benefit of all your expertise and your knowledge. Thank you so much.

CHAIR BERLYN: Thank you, Kris.

While we are waiting for our next speaker, let me go back to some introductory announcements. One of the things I didn't do before was recognize. I believe we have some people on the bridge, on the phone:

Indra Chalk, who is the alternate representative from T-Mobile; Clayton Lewis, Coleman Institute for Cognitive Disabilities; and Rebecca Ladew, Speech Communications and Assistance by Telephone. So welcome to those who are on the phone.

Before we adjourn for lunch, Scott will announce our breakout session. So we will do that, and we will talk about that later.

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

In your packet, new recommendations that we are going to address at the meeting this afternoon are on pink paper -- thank you, Scott -- to make it easy to recognize. That was Betty? Well, thank you.

Later on this afternoon, we will also be readopting three recommendations that we passed at our November meeting, just a process issue that we need to take care of.

I believe that is it. So we will take care of any other business later. don't want to give us a break right now, because we are expecting Josh Gottheimer momentarily. He must have gotten hung up in the Chairman's office, which I know often happens. So I don't want to let everybody out of the room, because I know his time is limited today. So if we leave the room and then he shows up, we will have to lock the door, and we have another speaker right after Josh. So we don't want to --

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Let me just ask if -- We have tried really hard to work out the room here so that everybody can see, but if there is anyone at the end of the room who is having any trouble seeing the speakers here, we do have one empty seat right next to Rick Chessen over here. If you do want to relocate, you are welcome to that.

Also, I noticed that the seat next to Irene is also empty. That member is not going to be here, at least not for the morning. So if you want to take that seat, that one is also right on the corner there. That one is also available. So please feel free to shuffle around, if you need to. Julie?

MS. KEARNEY: I'm happy to switch.

CHAIR BERLYN: Okay. We do have some flexibility. So, please, that is all I wanted to mention. If you need to, please feel flexible to do that. Yes, Ken?

MR. McELDOWNEY: I would really --

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

It would be great if the Commission could afford some power strips. I realize that is a radical idea, but -- Okay, good

CHAIR BERLYN: Paul?

MR. SCHROEDER: Paul Schroeder,
American Foundation for the Blind. I actually
just want to take a second. Although I don't
have any pink paper, I do want to compliment
Scott and the team, whoever was responsible,
for excellent Braille. I know that has been
an ongoing challenge for the Commission. So
thank you for producing material in Braille,
particularly for today's meeting, even though
I don't think there is any pink Braille in my
packet.

CHAIR BERLYN: That is most certainly Scott and his team.

So again, while we are waiting, just a couple of things to note on our agenda today. One of the things that we have done is we are heavy on issue substance this morning, and then we are on process this afternoon. So

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

that is sort of the way we have designed the schedule.

One of the things that we have added today, and you will see, right before our lunch break is a roundtable discussion. want to try and do during that What Ι discussion roundtable is to have opportunity to talk about the issues that have been presented in the morning, but also to discuss any other issues that you think the should be addressing that CAC we haven't perhaps talked about today or that we haven't brought up previously.

So something that you said, you know, this is something that the CAC should be working on -- so that is an opportunity for us to do that. So think about that, but that is something we have added, and hopefully, we can continue to do that at each of our CAC meetings.

Anyone have any new business? Oh, I just got an email. There we are.

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	MR. GOTTHEIMER: Morning.
2	CHAIR BERLYN: Good morning.
3	MR. GOTTHEIMER: Thanks for coming
4	on a Friday.
5	CHAIR BERLYN: I am very pleased
6	to introduce Josh Gottheimer, who got here
7	just in time before I had to start singing and
8	dancing. Welcome, Josh.
9	MR. GOTTHEIMER: I would like to
10	have seen that, actually. I am going to leave
11	now.
12	CHAIR BERLYN: Welcome. Thank you
13	so much for being here. We have had the
14	pleasure of welcoming the Chairman from time
15	to time and welcoming you here as Senior
16	
	Counsel for the Chairman, and we are really
17	Counsel for the Chairman, and we are really excited to hear about some of the highlights
17 18	
	excited to hear about some of the highlights
18	excited to hear about some of the highlights from the Chairman's office. So thank you for
18	excited to hear about some of the highlights from the Chairman's office. So thank you for being here.

1	CHAIR BERLYN: We could do that,
2	and I know your time is limited.
3	MR. GOTTHEIMER: I can do it. I
4	want to do what would be best for everybody.
5	CHAIR BERLYN: I think Does
6	anyone have any questions for Josh, and we
7	could just see if cards go up. That is one
8	way we could do it. I think it is obvious
9	that there is a National Broadband Plan that
10	is being implemented, that there have been
11	acts of Congress recently, that there are all
12	sorts of things that have been happening.
13	So I could probably ask about five
14	questions, but oops, there is a card.
15	MR. GOTTHEIMER: Okay.
16	CHAIR BERLYN: So why don't we
17	just see. Does anyone have any questions for
18	Josh?
19	MR. GOTTHEIMER: If you have
20	questions, I will open for a minute, and then
21	we can answer some questions. This way, we
22	use the time well, and I really want to make

sure that I address what is on your minds.

First, I want to begin, and on behalf of the Chairman who I spoke to a few minutes ago, I want to thank you all very, very much for your service and your work on this, and for being here. I know you are very busy. This is quite important that this FACA exists and is giving constant feedback and, Debbie, thanks for your good work.

CHAIR BERLYN: Thank you.

MR. GOTTHEIMER: The Chairman, as many of you know by now, is focused on -- has been focused on two big areas, and this goes back to his broadband plan, really the access to broadband and the adoption of broadband in this country for the purpose of, beyond anything, making sure that we are leading the world, that Americans have access to the best information and the best jobs and are able to keep our economy and our leadership in all areas, whether it is education or health care or technology, strong.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

We think broadband is critical to that. At the agency, there are lots of things we wake up thinking about every single day. Number one on that list, and that has many pieces, is broadband. The Chairman, when I first arrived, gave me a big box of Broadband cereal and said, you have to eat this every morning, and I think it is pretty accurate, because that is what we worry about.

The issues that are tied to that, of course, foremost one of them being consumer and making sure that consumers comfortable with and armed the best information to get broadband, but beyond that to make sure that we take every step possible prevent them being discouraged from to adopting, and that has lots of pieces to it as well that you know about, because if it goes a long way, you discourage people from making -to adopting and getting all the benefits out of broadband.

So I will get to that in a second,

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

but if you think about broadband every single day, you have got to focus on two pieces. One is the access to it and making sure that our country, everyone in the country, has an option, at least one, preferably more, to get high speed broadband at home, and to get mobile broadband, access to mobile broadband, wherever they are.

The reason we think it is so important that they have access at home, as I said, is because there is -- if you don't have access and you are left out of that, to me, you are living in a very -- the digital divide, and the other side of the divide nowadays is so severe and so -- You are really being left out of the economy. You are being left out of connecting with friends and family. You are being left out of education.

It is the other side of the opportunity divide. It is no longer an optional thing to be connected. It is a requirement to be a full part in society, and

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

we really believe that. So the access side and making sure you have a choice is quite important.

If you have noticed U.S. effort, steps we have taken on reforming USF, which was a significant achievement here, and working on the transition to broadband in the USF fund, obviously on the access side, on the mobile side. Just in the last week -- and I know many of you had a hand in this -- Congress passed and the President signed incentive option legislation for voluntary incentive options to try to get more to meet the ever growing demand of broadband.

We called it the spectrum crunch, because there is such a demand on spectrum, given the explosion of tablets and SmartPhones and all the other uses of wireless and mobile technology from both the licensed and unlicensed side.

We thought it was essential that we free up more spectrum, and we are beginning

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

that process now, studying the legislation, and we will take steps and have more to say soon on that, but that was a very big accomplishment for the country and an important step for connectivity.

That is the -- and then his whole spectrum agenda. There are many pieces that we have focused on to free up more spectrum. So that will continue to be a significant priority, because we can't afford to give up our mobile leadership. We are leading the world in 4G deployment.

We think it is essential from a business perspective, from technology leadership where we continue to be the envy of the world because of all of our start-ups and our existing companies that lead in this space.

Tom Friedman said it well recently where he said, you know, we may not be building everything in America anymore, but everything, I believe, is invented in --

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

innovated in the USA, and that is sort of what things should be stamped, "Innovated in the USA." I think that is right.

We really -- The intellectual capital behind so many of the new businesses and new products, whether it is the apps economy and all that is happening in the apps space or the content on the social media side -- just look at what is going on, and you understand why other people around the world are asking us how do they do it, too.

That is one piece, the access ID.

Then you have another huge problem which I know many of you grapple with, and one that we have spent a lot of time on lately that I have personally led a lot. It is the adoption of broadband side.

It is wonderful if people have access in their homes and on the go. But if they can't afford it or if they just can't get their hands on it or they don't know how to use it or don't understand why it matters to

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

them and why they should get it, you have got another significant problem; because those people also are being left on the other side of the digital divide, and they are into significant disadvantage.

So our adoption efforts -- and we just took steps in our lifeline reform with broadband pilots. Also, we proposed using more funding for digital literacy, and the Chairman helped launch a very important initiative called Connect to Compete which will -- the cable industry stepped up and offered to provide \$9.95 broadband for two years to any -- \$9.95 a month broadband for two years to any free school lunch eligible families.

There were a series of companies that came together around that, that are helping address some of the reasons people aren't adopting broadband. The three big ones are cost of the device and the connectivity — that is where the 9.95 comes in. We also have

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

the largest refurbisher in the country offer \$150 devices, refurbished devices, to school lunch eligible families.

On the digital literacy side, which is another big barrier, 40-plus million Americans -- I'm sorry, 60 million Americans are digitally illiterate and don't know how to use a device, whether it is get on email or use a mouse.

The fact that we have got so many people who don't have the basics, it is like reading, writing and arithmetic and, to me, it is also using computer. If you don't know how to use a device and that is the reason holding you back, we have to take steps to fix that.

Now America's public libraries are an incredible leader in the digital literacy space. There are 6,000 American public libraries that are offering basic digital literacy, about 38 percent of them in the country. We want to get that up to about 65 percent of the America's public libraries

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

offering basic digital literacy classes.

Best Buy has offered -- They are putting their Geek Squad forward, and they are going to be training people starting in 20 states how to do basic digital literacy and do classes for them.

Then the third barrier, which is the relevance piece of why do I need this in my life: A series of content providers on the jobs front for Clear Builder and monster.com and others and on the education front, people like Discovery, have offered up free content.

So whether it is job training, certification online, or homework helper for kids, if you can't afford a tutor, but there is all this wonderful rich content online, to low income Americans. So they have offered this up for free to low income Americans.

Our goal there is Connect and Compete, which is now actually being run outside of government in a nonprofit, a new nonprofit called Connect and Compete.

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

Our goal there is to ensure that more people, especially those who really can't afford it, to have shot aettina а at connected, because we know that a third of the country is not adopting broadband, which is just at home, which is а very, very significant number when you compare it to places like Singapore where it is 90-plus percent, but in low income areas and with minorities, the number is more like percent don't have broadband at home.

So think about that from your perspective. If we are worried that people are falling further and further behind if they are not connected, and then we know there is a huge swath of the country, maybe 50-60 percent, have certain populations which aren't getting online, that is a real problem.

We also know that it is a big seniors issue, a massive senior issue, and digital literacy, actually more than costs there, is a big problem, but cost is also a

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

significant issue.

If we walk away, and the Chairman walks away thinking that he hasn't dealt with the access side or hasn't dealt with the adoption side, if we hadn't taken steps, I think we would have been remiss, and I think that is why we are working feverishly to deal with that.

Just one last piece, and then I will open to questions: The other big initiative lately that I think you might be interested in that we are doing is on digital learning, another reason why you have broadband, because broadband, as I said, is not -- you don't just get broadband for the sake of having a pipe in your house for broadband. It is the reason you use it.

For some people, it is connecting to friends and family, and for others it is looking for a job or getting a job. But then the education piece -- it is so important to that, and we, from a meaningful use

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

perspective, think it is critical.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Now not all of Julie's clients are going to think that that -- Not everyone wakes up every day thinking I am going to build something for this purpose. They might do it for social reasons or for showing video. We think that is wonderful, too, but we think the meaningful use piece on education, for instance, is so important.

The Chairman, two weeks ago, announced with Secretary Duncan -- challenged the ecosystem of those who do learning and textbooks in this country. It is a \$7 billion industry, by the way -- a year, just in case you are wondering if there is any money being made in textbooks, and it is a great business, by the way, like every seven years you get to change a few words and put on a new cover. You slap a new cover on and just charge it again for it. schools So is a great business model, if you can get it.

There has been no innovation or

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

very little. I don't want to offend them, but very little innovation in that space. There has been some, but compared to where other industries are, it has been small. It is our children and we are paying the taxpayer dollars for all this stuff. You would think there would be a little bit more, but if you got a good thing, why change it.

You should see what is going on in the digital industry. The explosion of innovation in the last two years or three years is remarkable. If you have a tablet, basically, imagine this, just to give you a perspective of what is available right now, increasingly affordable available right now.

You have a tablet, and at night your child goes home, and they open it up and on it is not your static text, which is one size fits all, but it is actually this incredibly engaging personalized learning experience where you open up algebra or geometry, and the shapes pop out and move

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

around and turn around, and there are videos about the solar system, and they can do assignments through social media, connect with other people in their class, and the textbook learns as your child goes through the textbook.

So there is а company called Newton, very interesting right now, that is taking thousands of data points as your child is reading their textbook or their digital textbook. So you turn the page, and it notes how long you spend on each section. You learn better visually, because you spend less time, and you answer questions more accurately when you see it visually or, when it is written, you do better. If it is written in bullets, you do better, and the textbook actually just changes to you, to conform to how you learn, because think about it. We don't really do fits all. Yet we anything one size textbooks one size fits all for all kids, and we know that kids learn differently.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Then at the end of the section on triangles, you realize -- remember, we used to take those 10 questions at the end. You rip out the page. You hand it to the teacher or you just hand in your homework assignment and you take it out to see if you understood the chapter on triangles or on isosceles triangles.

imagine that at the end of Well, the chapter, you child answers the questions. It shoots -- A shoots the answers grades it, shoots it to your teacher. that is one piece. That seems pretty simple. Teacher doesn't have to grade 1,000 papers. But beyond that, it says, ah, Johnny is having problems with isosceles triangles, and it automatically right there pops in another workbook section chapter or isosceles triangles and says, oh, you having problems; let's do a few more, and I can see you are not learning well this way, but why don't you try it this way and see if

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

that will help you.

We know that, if a kid goes -- By the fourth grade, if kids are behind, they never catch up. So imagine we make sure that at night they do whatever they can to catch up. So the textbook learns. Then it sends a note to the teacher, not just on how you did, but it sends a note and says these five kids are having problems or not understanding this piece of the triangle section; why don't you spend another 20 minutes in class tomorrow teaching about that, because we are going to lose a third of your class.

Then when they are in the class sitting there teaching -- and you all remember this from being in school -- and you are teaching, and half the kids sort of doze off or they are not really understanding what the teacher is saying.

As you are sitting there with your tablet, it sends every 20 minutes -- the teacher can send a pop question to the tablet,

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

and you answer yes or no on your little survey, and on the teacher's tablet it shows like, actually, a third of the class has no idea what you are talking about. You better circle back and spend time on that.

That is after, when you walked in in the morning, the textbook checked you in, because you know you are there and sends a little -- this is happening in several states right now. It sends a text to your parents and says Johnny arrived, because it knows you arrived. Of course, the kids are really good at cutting school will give it to a friend to carry their tablet into school that day.

This is wonderful, but here is the problem. If a kid is not connected -- If there is no connectivity outside the schoolhouse door, because eRay, obviously, deals with a piece of the connectivity in school -- if there is no connectivity outside the schoolhouse door, it doesn't work. The whole system shuts down. That is why the

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

wonderful part of it or the rich part of it is being connected at home.

with the Ecosystem right now. We ran a whole process with Co-Chair for the Department of Education with the tablet manufacturers, with the connectivity, the inter-surf providers and connectivity folks, with the content players, and said how do we actually produce a really affordable product here? How can you do it? There are people to come together to produce a whole product, and how do we deal with the connectivity issues, and how do we make this so that it works, it is affordable?

The price points work, but how do we get it out to the country? So that is what the Chairman and the Secretary challenged this industry to get done, so that in five years every kid, K-12, has one of these.

We are there. there is no reason this shouldn't be happening technologically. Now we just have to get there. So that is an

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	example of the sort of thing that we are
2	working on that brings to life the reason this
3	agency exists every day. And I will end
4	there.
5	CHAIR BERLYN: Thank you, Josh. I
6	do notice that cards have gone up while you
7	have been talking, and continue to go up.
8	MR. GOTTHEIMER: They tacking what
9	I am saying.
10	CHAIR BERLYN: Mitsy, I think your
11	card went up before Josh even got in the room.
12	So go for it, and then Claude and Irene,
13	Paul, Chris. We have got a lot. I will write
14	names down, but we will start with Mitsy here.
15	MS. HERRERA: Good morning.
16	CHAIR BERLYN: Remember to raise
17	your hands, so the booth knows, and do make
18	your questions short, because I know that
19	Josh's time is limited.
20	MS. HERRERA: Good morning, Josh.
21	First, I was struck by thinking that the
22	broadband breakfast cereal should be replaced

1	with Broadband Crunch with little crunch
2	berries, you know, like the little shiny
3	things.
4	MR. GOTTHEIMER: That is a good
5	idea.
6	MS. HERRERA: So I am really glad
7	and this is a big issue for local
8	governments, particularly as we move, we roll
9	out. We try to get more information that is
10	online and access, and those are big issues
11	for us. So I want to press you.
12	First is on accountability. The
13	Connect to Compete program is based on the
14	terms and conditions that the Commission
15	negotiated with Comcast as part of the
16	Universal Service at least part of the
17	rollout for the school age children of the
18	broadband services and the 9.95.
19	Do you have any statistics back
20	from Comcast as to how many chidden were
21	eligible in their areas, and how many children

have actually signed up, because we have

significant feedback from people that the process itself makes it very difficult for people to actually get the service?

MR. GOTTHEIMER: Good question.

Two responses. One, through Comcast/NBC merger, the company offered to do an adoption program, of course, one that we worked with them on. That was called Internet Essentials.

So that is a separate -- It is a very similar program to Connect to Compete.

Connect to Compete is a voluntary program from the rest of the industry, the cable industry, that offered to provide \$9.95 broadband similar to Comcast, only the terms were slightly different.

Comcast, just about two weeks ago -- I think it was about two weeks ago -- put out a report on accountability, which we can get to you, on their statistics -- I don't want to cite them from memory -- on what they are seeing so far.

I thought, actually, it was a very

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

good step forward. They are being hard on themselves. The gentleman who is really overseeing the program, David Cohen, one of their leaders, is spending quite a bit of time and actually taking it very seriously and going above and beyond.

In fact, they announced they were making -- The initial claim that they made was for free school lunch eligible, which was what Connect to Compete is. They offered, starting next year they are going to do free and reduced. So they are expanding their population voluntarily, just because they see it going well.

They admit that this is not easy, and part of the challenge here -- and Connect to Compete, I know, is struggling with this, too, although making a lot of progress on how to do this -- is to verify that someone is school lunch eligible. There is no national database. Even the states don't have the databases. It is all -- In most cases, you

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

say you are school lunch eligible.

So what Comcast is requiring, and the other cable companies, is some sort of proof of that, and that is why it has been complicated, because they have to send in this -- You say you are interested. You just send in the document.

The companies and Comcast commit this, too, and we are working with the other companies on this, are finding a way to, if you give certain data points in, where you live -- so Census information, stock information -- plus what school you go to which shows what percentage are school lunch eligible. If you hit a certain threshold, you don't have to go through that process. You automatically qualify.

I think that is going to make a huge difference in dealing with the roadblock that is up there. It is a shame that there is no national -- that we have no database to check. It is a problem we have with Lifeline,

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	too, and it is part of what the reforms of
2	Lifeline is finding, a database; because you
3	might imagine these companies don't want to
4	that are doing this, don't want to lose a lot
5	of money and have all these people who really
6	don't qualify, quality, and I don't blame
7	them, but also I have been really pressing
8	them to say we've got to find a better way,
9	because we can't lose a huge swath of people,
10	because it is too hard.
11	So this has been one of my biggest
12	issues, the eligibility screen, and we are
13	working very, very hard on it.
14	If you want to talk about other
15	issues they are having, I am going to give you
16	my card, and I would love to connect with you,
17	and we can talk about specifics.
18	MS. HERRERA: I would just say
19	that at the school level they have that
20	information.
21	MR. GOTTHEIMER: Yes.

MS.

HERRERA: And if you just

created a very simple database that they could upload that information at the local school level, you could at least start to --

MR. GOTTHEIMER: They tried this. We just had a five-hour meeting with them yesterday. They have tried this. Schools are really -- The school leaders are really busy, and the feedback they are getting from schools is, if you make t his really easy for me, I will hand out a flyer and stuff it into the school lunch packets, but if you require us to do anything, we have so many demands on our time.

A lot of the schools are -- They have to still get permission from each kid to release -- each parent has to sign a waiver to actually let the school give that information out. So unless the school has a database themselves, each school that Comcast or enter Connect to Compete, it won't work, because they still need -- You can't just give this information out. It is all confidential.

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

So this is like the big problem. Otherwise, they would just be handing over the list. They actually have to get permission from each individual parent. It is really -- The process is just aggravating, but we are trying to work around it.

MS. HERRERA: I will just though, that on all of these national programs, the accountability -- and, frankly, there are programs at the local level, they are not national, that actually engage in broadband adoption addressing the relevance issue, and finding ways for the FCC to drive these national programs, not just seek people who have a presence in 50 states, but to actually engage with people who are regional based, effective who have very I might just put that in your ear. measures.

MR. GOTTHEIMER: I completely agree. That is one of the reasons why Connect to Compete has about 25 people like United Way and 4-H and all these national organizations

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

which are going to their local organizations and bringing them in, the ones that at least have national footprints, because you need somebody to coordinate with.

I would say you are right. The more -- but it is hard to know every single organization. What will continue to happen is they are finding out state by state who they should be connecting with at the local level, but it is really hard to get all that information.

I know they are using -- Connect to Compete is using every single organization, whether it is the Untied Way or the mayors or local officials or all the national organizations that represent all the local people, to try to get to them, and the public libraries are talking to every local public library through the American Library Association.

So it is hard. They don't have the resources to go themselves one by one, but

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	they can use all these organizations to get
2	there. It is hard stuff, and I think it will
3	keep getting better and better as more people
4	know about it. There is no point in having
5	these programs if people don't know about
6	them.
7	On the accountability front, I
8	know that Connect to Compete has hired Nicol
9	Turner-Lee at the Joint Center from the
10	accountability to study this incessantly to
11	make sure that it is actually moving a dial.
12	That has to be done. The accountability is
13	critical. If we have no accountability, why
14	have these programs? So I am with you 180
15	percent, and we should talk more about this.
16	CHAIR BERLYN: Okay. We are going
17	to have to move on, and Josh needs to leave.
18	Josh, can you take, what, one, two more
19	questions?
20	MR. GOTTHEIMER: I'm checking.
21	CHAIR BERLYN: And Kim, who is

next, has to start.

1 MR. GOTTHEIMER: So we could do a 2 couple more questions. 3 CHAIR BERLYN: Two more questions, 4 and Claude, quick. Two quick questions. statements. That is a no statement rule. 5 6 MR. STOUT: Can you hear me okay? 7 Josh, I wanted you to know that the National Broadband Plan is one of the best things that 8 has happened to us in the disability community 9 10 in my 15 years of working with the FCC. 11 Ι bring to wanted to your I'm 12 attention that sure that you 13 Verizon phone. I have an AT&T phone. were hearing and I could call you anytime, no 14 15 matter which company I was using, if you were 16 -- and no matter which company you were using. We would be able to talk on the phone. 17 it is not that easy, and it is not so with us 18 19 in the deaf community. 20 people Deaf are using If you have an iPhone and I have an 21 phones.

iPhone, then we could talk through video, but

if you have an iPhone and I have a Blackberry, then we can't chat on the phone through video chat.

So even though the experience happens through voice communication, it is not happening through video, and we would like that same kind of experience, and it something that we look forward to working with you on, because it would require a lot of companies working together, like Google and Apple Microsoft coming together and collaborate, along with mobile companies to do that sort of collaboration.

So I just wanted to call that simple thing to your attention.

MR. GOTTHEIMER: Thank you, and I am glad you did. As you know, when that started with the Broadband Plan, this FCC has been, I think, historically committed to working this issue and figuring it out. Our office here that addresses these issues, I think, is one of the best that the FCC has

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

ever had.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

In fact, I was just in a meeting yesterday talking about these issues. So please know that we are incredibly committed We have to figure them out. to them. heard me, that I think we can't afford for anyone to be on the side of the unconnected, and if everyone doesn't get to experience the it is benefits, then going to have tremendous cost to not just our social side of life, but our economy. Know that working these issues hard.

CHAIR BERLYN: Paul, you get the last quick question. Oh, Chris, you stepped in there. Thank you, Paul.

MR. BAKER: Thank you, Paul. My question is about the Connect to Compete. First of all, I appreciate your mention of desire to get more older adults online. I just wanted to make sure that you understood that not many older adults qualify for the school lunch program, one point.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	Then also, in that National
2	Broadband Plan, the one recommendation that
3	addresses the Consumer Advisory Committee by
4	name is the Connect to Compete program. I
5	just wanted to get your thoughts as to how you
6	and this is probably a question for when we
7	have more time, but how you envision the CAC
8	responding to that.
9	MR. GOTTHEIMER: To the question
10	of?
11	MR. BAKER: To the Connect to
12	Compete initiative and sort of monitoring
13	their progress and reporting back on
14	suggestions and so forth. It was actually
15	mentioned in the National Broadband Plan.
16	MR. GOTTHEIMER: Yes. Well,
17	Connect to Compete wasn't, but you are right,
18	the adoption idea was.
19	CHAIR BERLYN: The concept.
20	MR. GOTTHEIMER: Yes. So one of
21	the things on the older Americans front and
22	Debbie knows this, because we have been

working on this -- we are very eager to do more on that front. I will tell you candidly that the response from the community has been slow. We are very eager from the FCC's perspective to do more.

We believe, and I believe, you have got -- I could look at the stats -- a big challenge with not enough seniors being connected, and I know from someone who -- daughter Skypes with her grandmother at least four days a week, and my mother keeps a good healthy distance.

MR. BAKER: We are happy to give you a list of programs that might qualify for it, if you want to add it to the school lunch program.

MR. GOTTHEIMER: I know that the cable -- I am just kidding, Mom, in case you are reading the record here. I will tell you that the cable industry offered something, and we believe it is a massive commitment on their end, like a \$3 billion commitment, and the

whole program is a \$4 billion and time commitment.

We believe that it is very important. I can't speak for the industry who offered this on a voluntary basis about what they are going to do to expand, and I know that. So I will leave that to them, but I will tell you from the FCC's perspective, beyond that program we have to do more to find ways to connect people and to knock down the barriers, and there are lots of things we can do to get there.

We have had several meetings to try to figure out what it will take. Is it more on digital literacy, and should we be working with more of the seniors organizations to provide more digital literacy and training?

Are there more programs we could do through American Public Libraries to deal with the training?

On the relevance side, are there things we should be doing, and put aside the

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

cost side for now. There are lots of other -There are also a lot of other obstacles in
the way. At least, that is what the research
shows, besides costs.

Let's all work together and figure out if we can get there on costs. I am all for everyone talking to everybody else and seeing if there is something we can do, but what I would hope is this has to be a more urgent priority for the older American community, and we are ready to do more and work through this together, because I think we have to, and there is no reason not to.

So I am committed, if you are.

CHAIR BERLYN: And we do need to move forward. I would suggest that, for the second part of your question or the first part -- I don't remember which part it was, but our role -- we talk about that later today.

We have talked very informally, but I think that that is something that we actually need to address and talk about. So

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	we will do that, Josh, and take your
2	advisement at some point, but we need to
3	continue that conversation.
4	MR. GOTTHEIMER: Excellent.
5	Thanks, Debbie.
6	CHAIR BERLYN: Thank you very
7	much.
8	MR. GOTTHEIMER: Thank you all
9	very, very much again for what you are doing.
10	It is invaluable for us. Please let me know
11	if you have questions. I am going to leave
12	cards here with Debbie. So if you want to
13	call me or talk to me or send notes, harass
14	me, harangue me, I'm all for it. Everyone in
15	Washington does. So you might as well. But
16	thank you, really, very much. Thanks.
17	CHAIR BERLYN: Thank you, Josh.
18	Don't anybody leave. We are very
19	pleased to have Kim Scardino join us at the
20	table. Kim has been with us before, because
21	she has been dealing with a really important

issue for consumers and for, I know, a lot of

CAC members, Lifeline, and the recent order that came out on Lifeline and Link-up Reform and Modernization.

Kim is Deputy Chief,
Telecommunications Access Policy Division fop
the Wireline Competition Bureau. So we are
very pleased to have you again, Kim. Thank
you, and thank you for your patience. I know
we are running a little late. So sorry about
that.

MS. SCARDINO: You should never have Josh going before. I am just kidding. I am not as funny as him. So this will be more serious, I think.

Thanks for having me back, and I am thrilled that the Lifeline reform order has been released, and now we can -- I know everybody here has read it and understands the whole thing. No. It is a long order and a lot of new rules. The entire program has really been revamped in a lot of ways.

What I thought I would do is give

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

you the highlights, and then save time for questions. I have certainly gotten a lot of questions from folks. I spoke at NARUC and for the Joint Board as well as some other states. So I have been talking a lot with the states about some of their questions. So I will try as I go along to address some of the things that have been raised since the order was released.

of the best things think that the order does is it puts all eligible telecommunications carriers under the largely. rules There same differences, but before we had a situation where you had some of the forbearance carriers operating under certain rules that were different from what everyone else was operating under, and the purpose of the order was really to put everybody under the same rules, so that there was clear guidance to the states and, of course, you see about what everyone should be doing when they sign people

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

up for Lifeline and continue to serve them.

The order, for the first time, adopts three goals for the Lifeline program, as well as some measures, and also simplifies the definition for the supported service to make it consistent with the supported service that was adopted in the Connect America Fund order, replacing the nine list of services with what we call voice telepathy service.

Along those lines, it also talks a lot about what constitutes facilities for purposes of providing that supported service, and it grants conditional forbearance to those carriers that had previously relied on the operator services directory assistance type of service to become facilities based providers when they got designated.

The order basically doesn't disrupt any service that is being provided right now, and sets forth a process whereby those carriers that had previously relied on facilities that are no longer supported

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

services, that they could come to the FCC and get a compliance plan approved and continue operating services, and those that haven't been yet designated would first get a compliance plan from us.

The compliance plan process will just be that they file a document explaining how they will comply with the rules in the order, how they will sign people up for Lifeline. We are going to be issuing a public notice next week to carriers explaining what they need to put in those compliance plans.

The order also adopts, starting April 1st, a flat rate reimbursement, which we think administratively will be a lot easier for everyone. Before, we had a three-tiered process for non-travel support.

The order doesn't do anything to disrupt the current tier 4 travel support, but it replaces the old process, which was a bit antiquated, because it relied on subscriber line charge of the ILEC that really had

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

nothing to do at all with the service being provided.

So it replaced it with a flat rate of \$9.25, and we look at that as an interim rate, subject to -- we have a further notice asking questions about what the permanent rate should be and whether that is enough support. so we are anxious to get feedback on that from carriers.

I would say the heart of the order relates to the eligibility and certification and recertification for Lifeline. Prior to this, you had largely a self-certification model where consumers signed up for Lifeline saying that they were eligible, without really proving that they were enrolled in any kind of program.

We always had a rule that, for income, that the consumer needed to show that they were eligible, but on the program based side it was self-certification. The certification forms that the carriers had were

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

largely very small font, really not explaining that it was a Federal benefit that the customer was signing up for, what Lifeline was.

The intent of the order is really focused on consumers, so the consumers really understand that they are signing up for a benefit.

When we did a 12-state duplicate process that we went through to contact consumers that had more than one Lifeline, we found that a lot of consumers called in and said they didn't even realize that they were signed up for more than one Lifeline. I think that the revised certification process will go a long way at consumers understanding that they are actually signing up for a Federal benefit and what the requirements are for that benefit.

So along those lines, the order establishes uniform eligibility criteria that are a floor that the states can go beyond.

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

That basically means that in any state a consumer can sign up for Lifeline through income, which is 135 percent of the Federal poverty guideline, or through participation in a qualifying program.

At a minimum, the state needs to accept the Federal programs, and a state could add additional programs if it has a program in its state that is income based and meets the criteria established in the order.

So anywhere that somebody can -- anybody that is eligible for Lifeline can sign up, either through proving that they meet the income threshold or that they participate in one of the qualifying programs.

I have gotten some questions from states about what that means, and basically what it means is anywhere, any consumer should be able to sign up for Lifeline either through income or program, and that the states are certainly free to add programs to the list, the Federal list.

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

Along those lines -- and Olivia was very helpful on this next point, which is the one per household rule, which is really a one per economic unit rule, and you could interpret it as one per family. It is one per economic unit.

We had in the Notice of Proposed Rulemaking that the Commission released in March had proposed a one per residential address, and we heard from people that came in said, you know, there's multiple and households that often live at any address, and you shouldn't go with that definition. So we didn't. We went with a definition that allows multiple economic units that might share an address to get Lifeline.

At the same time, it also allows people living in group living facilities to get Lifeline as well, which before prior to this order was a bit unclear with the way the rules were before. You didn't see a lot of Lifeline participation from people living in

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

group living facilities, and we certainly know that we got a lot of questions about that on the way, about why people that did live in group living facilities couldn't get Lifeline.

definition is based on The LIHEAP, the Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program, definition, with a few tweaks. order directs USAC to come up with materials that will guide states and ETCs and consumers alike to kind of plain English "what does this mean" and gives scenarios like two families living together at the same address, multi-generational families living together, two roommates, all those different scenarios, and USAC will be developing materials that will be available in print format as well as on the website to give a little context about what this definition means for consumers.

The way we envision when somebody signs up for Lifeline, we are ultimate going to have a duplicate database that would check.

For everybody that is in the program,

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

everyone that is currently enrolled in the program would be in the database.

So if somebody came along at that same address and wanted to get Lifeline, they would be given then a worksheet, which USAC is developing, that would allow the person to figure out whether they are part of the same economic unit as that person that is at that address.

We think that will be a simple process for consumers to, if an ETC is signing somebody up or a state and sees that somebody at that address already has Lifeline, they will give them the worksheet to figure out if they are part of that same economic unit or not and, if they are not, then they would be signing up for Lifeline and be put into the database.

The certification: We didn't come up with a uniform certification form that everybody has to use, because we knew that states and ETCs have their own forms now, and

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

instead we chose to -- in an appendix, which is Appendix C -- list all the things that need to be updated on that certification form.

So everyone take their can existing forms and just update it with all the things that need to be part of that form, and that all has to just be done by June 1st. June 1st is the date that the one per and the certification will household effect. Hopefully, by then USAC will have all those materials.

Right now the Federal process for when somebody signs up, as I mentioned, it is self-certification. But now under this rule, a consumer would need to demonstrate that they are indeed eligible. That could be done one of two ways.

The first, which is the preferred method, is if there is a database that exists in a state, the carrier or the state needs to use it to check for eligibility. We recognize that some states do have databases, and we

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

will be looking to them as a model for how we can get the other states to put their data online as well. But if a state does not have a database available to check for eligibility, the subscriber would need to show that they are indeed eligible by showing their Food Stamp card, their Medicaid card.

This is another thing that the order directs USAC to develop materials about what those look like. What does a Food Stamp card, and what does a Medicaid card look like. Those would all be online for ETCs to use in their training and have available to people, so that the reps that are signing people up would know that looks like.

After somebody is enrolled in Lifeline, then you have the challenge about whether they continue to remain eligible. Oh, I should note that the order only requires new subscribers to demonstrate that they are eligible. It doesn't require that the carriers or the states go back and get proof

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

of eligibility from their entire subscriber base, because right now there are 13.5 million subscribers. So it is a going forward basis, again starting June 1st.

There is always a challenge about how you know if somebody continues to be eligible for the program and whether they even continue to want the service. So the order sets forth a process that replaces the current verification sample process, which required that ETCs take a sample of their subscribers, and subscribers would need to prove that they are eligible.

Ιt replaces that with an annual recertification process where the ETCs need to contact all of their subscribers on a rolling throughout basis the year to have the subscriber certify that they remain eligible, no one at their household -- no one that was in their household is getting Lifeline, and a couple of other things that they would attest They would provide that form back to the

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

carrier.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Now that process can be done on paper, online, via phone through an IVR, Interactive Voice Response, unit system, or through text in the case of wireless. So the order sets forth all of those rules for how that could be done.

We think it is really important 2012, that that the first year, in the carriers or the states if they do function for carriers the contact their subscribers to see if they remain eligible. This is something that hasn't been done except only TracFone and Virgin Mobile do this today.

A lot of people have been on Lifeline for a long time, and no one has contacted them to see if they want to remain in the program. So there would be like this initial outreach in 2012, starting in June, from June until the end of the year, that everyone needs to contact their subscribers and recertify them and report the results to

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

USAC at the end of January 2013.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Then starting in 2013, this would be done on a rolling basis, again first by checking the database, if a database is available, but if not, then going to the subscriber to see if they remain eligible. That could be done on a rolling basis.

also The order gives Ιf feel like they can't do this, carriers for whatever reason, they think it is burdensome or they are not able to do it, they could have USAC perform that function for them.

So just moving on, I won't touch on everything in the order, but one of the things that I mentioned, the database, the duplicate database, that is something that we are moving forward with and hope to be done within a year, to have a system where carriers would be able to tell if somebody is already receiving the benefit.

We have done the duplicate process

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

in 12 states, which I talked about last time I was here, and we are going to continue that process in about another 16 to 17 states this year, while the database is being constructed, and there will be the same process we did before.

Before, we had a system where the carriers were paying for the customer care functionality, and that is being brought in.

USAC is performing that function and paying for it out of the fund.

The order eliminates link up support for carriers serving non-tribal lands, and on tribal lines only those carriers that are high cost recipients would be able to get Link Up. The Commission has found that Link Up was being abused and that some carriers were getting it; some weren't.

The carriers that were getting it were serving the same areas as those that weren't getting it. So the Commission concluded that it was a waste of resources for

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

the funds to be giving a Link Up subsidy to some carriers and not others in the same area.

Similarly but a little different, toll limitation service: The order clarifies even entitled to toll limitation who is service support and who needs to provide it. Basically, if a subscriber can pick up the phone and dial -- make toll calls that incur additional fees, then the carrier needs to offer toll limitation service and could get But if the subscriber is offered all support. minutes where it can't distance incur additional charges for making a toll call, then toll limitation service is not necessary and, certainly, the carrier should not be seeking support for it.

The order adopts a 60-day non-usage condition, which really only applies to prepaid wireless carriers that offer the service for free. The order does not require a minimum charge. The carriers are still allowed to offer the service for free like

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

they have been doing, but those free carriers have this extra condition, that they need to make sure that the subscriber is using the service.

So after 60 days, if that customer has not used the service, they need to check in with them and see if they want to continue with the service, and if they don't, then they have to be de-enrolled from Lifeline, and that carrier shouldn't be seeking money from the fund.

also established activation We requirements, that phones couldn't be shipped to people that were pre-activated, because we complaints that consumers got some shipped phones that they never ordered, and they were already activated. So that company was seeking money from the fund, but nobody was actually using the service. So somebody needs to activate the service before that carrier can seek reimbursement under the fund.

One part of the order relates to

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

consumer disclosures. It is called Marketing and Outreach, but it is largely a disclosure section about what consumers need to be told about the service, that the product is a Lifeline supported product, that it is a government benefit, and what you need for enrollment.

Some of the things we were seeing, like these "refer a friend" programs where you could send a Lifeline link to somebody that wasn't even eligible. So that needs to be clear, that you need to be eligible in order to qualify for the benefit, and it is a benefit for low income consumers, not just something that anybody can get.

There is also in this same section of the order a discussion about the need for consumer outreach about the new rule, and this is where I think the Consumer Advisory Committee can really play a role. I don't know when you are meeting next, but this is something I would love for you to give us some

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

recommendations for how we and the Consumer Government Affairs Bureau -- Gayle Teicher is here from that Bureau -- We are going to be working on a campaign to reach consumers about what the new rules are.

One of the things we did during the duplicate process was public service states, announcements in the and Intergovernmental Affairs folks that go out to conferences were passing out literature. will all be updated, but if you all feel that are other ways that we can consumers, we would love to hear it. So I encourage you to look at that section of the order.

There are audit provisions for new carriers as well as ones that are independent audit requirements for carriers that take more than 5 million on annual from the fund.

It also moves the -- Right now, the program basically pays people on projected lines, and this will move the program to

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

people actually submitting for actual. It is really an administrative issue, but that all happens in the fall.

Then as Josh was talking about, the order establishes a broadband pilot. It sets aside \$25 million for the pilot that would -- The way we envision -- The order sets forth kind of an outline of how this would work, but there will be a public notice calling for pilot participants, and there will be at least 45 days for carriers to file their applications to participate in the pilot.

Then there would be a selection process, and the pilot participants then will offer broadband service to qualifying low income consumers. I know there were some questions about the school lunch. Well, t his would be all the Lifeline eligibility criteria, both income as well as all the programs.

So it will be a broad community that would be able to participate in this, and

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

we are looking forward to having a robust pilot. We have had some interest, some carriers that have called and asked questions about it. So we are hoping that we will see a good size number of applicants.

Then there is a further notice attached to the item. I won't go into detail about it, but those comments will be due 30 days after it is published, and I am hoping it will be published by March 1st. So they will be due around April 1st, and we will do a public notice announcing the comment phase.

I talked longer than I wanted to.

So I apologize, and I can take a couple of questions.

CHAIR BERLYN: I am going to go around this side. Well, it looks like the cards are actually coming with the exception of Paul who I passed on last time. So I am going to go to Paul first, and then I am going to go from that end of the table, since we started here last time. So, Paul.

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	We are running behind, of course,
2	and I know you have a meeting. So we are
3	going to try to get as many questions in.
4	Paul, and then Cecilia.
5	MR. SCHROEDER: Thanks. Paul
6	Schroeder with the American Foundation for the
7	Blind. No statement.
8	CHAIR BERLYN: Yes, thank you.
9	MR. SCHROEDER: Any provisions
10	regarding the kind of phones that are
11	distributed, if people with disabilities are
12	requesting in terms of access features, how is
13	that being handled?
14	MS. SCARDINO: That is something
15	that we have teed up for resolution in Notice
16	of Proposed Rule Making. So it is not a draft
17	in the order. There is nothing specific
18	related. The devices are not supported under
19	the fund. It is the service itself. So we
20	didn't address that issue in the order.
21	MR. SCHROEDER: So that is to say
22	that somebody with a disability would be

1	eligible for the service and not be able to
2	obtain an equipment a device that is
3	accessible under that order?
4	MS. SCARDINO: Well, it just
5	depends on if the ETC offers the service.
6	There is not a discussion in here about the
7	devices, because those aren't supported by the
8	fund.
9	MR. SCHROEDER: I'm sorry. The
10	issue is no longer relevant. Is there not
11	going to be an opportunity to comment on that?
12	We missed it, obviously.
13	MS. SCARDINO: I think, in the
14	further notice where it asks about the support
15	levels, you could always weigh in on that
16	issue in the further notice.
17	MR. SCHROEDER: Thank you.
18	CHAIR BERLYN: Cecilia.
19	MS. GARCIA: Cecilia Garcia with
20	the Benton Foundation. I have a real quick
21	question, and it has to do with some of the
22	savings that are being derived from kind of

addressing fraud, waste and abuse.

We have heard that at least 25 million, as you say, of those savings are going to be dedicated to the broadband pilot programs. I have also heard that an additional up to 50 million may be used for digital literacy, also derived from the savings there.

So my question is: While we revery supportive of the effort for digital literacy, the concern is will that effort be within the USF framework so that accountability is built into it; and if not, how will the FCC ensure that the low income consumers for whom Lifeline is designed will actually benefit from the digital literacy funds, if it is derived from that?

MS. SCARDINO: There is also a savings target that we need to hit in 2012 or keep track of. We are being very -- The rules are very proactive at getting at that waste. So we are fairly confident that -- We already

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

know, like for the broadband pilot, example, USAC filed an ex parte like three before order weeks the voted that was quantified the savings associated with just duplicate outreach in 12 states, doing the which was \$35 million, just by looking at duplicates in 12 states with the top four carriers in those states.

are going this year and So we doing at least another 16 of those, expanding it to more carriers. So we confident that we will be able to -- I think what your question is, is your concern that there wouldn't be the funding available for these things, but I think, in light of the new rules, we think that the waste that is there today that the rules will address that, like the link up issue, for example.

Link up this year was projected to be \$180 million, and we eliminated -- The order eliminates it except for high cost recipients on tribal lands.

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

CHAIR BERLYN: Interesting.

Dorothy?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

I participated July 1st MS. WALT: of this year in the National Deaf/Blind Equipment Distribution Program, and I was just thinking that Lifeline and Link Up would be very beneficial for so many consumers who are participating in that program. However, if I remember correctly, the National Deaf-Blind Equipment Distribution Program, the applicants must meet the Federal poverty guideline of 400 percent.

I think you said that Lifeline or Link Up was 135 percent, if I am correct. I am not sure if that is the right number, but I am wondering how we are going to reconcile those two figures, because many of the deafblind people who qualify for equipment under the Deaf-Blind Equipment Distribution Program at 400 percent of Federal poverty guidelines will not qualify under -- if they are over 135 percent. Is that the right amount, 135

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	percent?
2	MS. SCARDINO: It is 135 percent
3	of the Federal poverty guidelines.
4	MS. WALT: Ah, right. So those
5	two programs are not going to reconcile, if
6	the deaf-blind person is over the 135 percent.
7	They don't quality for the Lifeline or the
8	Link Up. So I am seeing that might be an
9	unfair or sort of a discriminatory
10	reconciliation between the two programs,
11	because many deaf-blind people will probably
12	want to participate in the Lifeline or Link
13	Up. Thank you.
14	CHAIR BERLYN: I think Karen is
15	going to Karen Peltz Strauss, our next
16	speaker, can address this at her presentation
17	which is up next in just a few minutes. One
18	more question, Stephen?
19	MR. POCIASK: I am Steve Pociask.
20	I am with the American Consumer Institute. I
21	want to make sure I understand. You talked

about some individuals who would quality based

on programs, but you also said succinctly that there also would be some income based. I want to understand how that works.

Let's say, for example, we have a connected household with above average income, just as an example. They have a child, a 22-year-old child out of school, not working. They have, let's say, a spouse who receives minimal income, but files separately. You have an aunt who is retired living in a room separately.

Do those individuals potentially quality for Lifeline?

MS. SCARDINO: It depends on -Potentially. It depends the way we set the
definition is all adult individuals
contributing to and sharing in the income and
expenses of the household. So it is an "and,"
contributing to and sharing in the expenses of
the household.

Those are the types of scenarios that USAC will be developing for the

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	materials. There is a link in the order. The
2	WIC program has really a great tool that we
3	found online that allows people to input all
4	those scenarios that you just mentioned to
5	figure out who on that list could quality.
6	CHAIR BERLYN: Thank you so much,
7	Kim. It is great information. You
8	synthesized a very long order for us. So we
9	greatly appreciate that. So thank you.
10	MS. SCARDINO: All right. Great.
11	Thanks.
12	CHAIR BERLYN: Hang in there,
13	gang. We are almost at a break, but if you
14	could, just stay seated for another one of our
15	speakers who has been very patient with our
16	scheduling this morning.
17	MS. PELTZ STRAUSS: Do you all
18	want to stand up? Everybody stand up and
19	stretch.
20	CHAIR BERLYN: I am not sure that
21	will help, because I think what we need is not
22	a stretch, but that is okay.

1	MS. PELTZ STRAUSS: Seventh inning
2	stretch. I am a little bit nervous about
3	standing between you and the next speaker and
4	lunch.
5	CHAIR BERLYN: We are going to
6	take a break after Karen. So we are almost at
7	the home stretch.
8	MS. PELTZ STRAUSS: Okay. Well,
9	bear with me.
10	CHAIR BERLYN: Karen Peltz
11	Strauss, Deputy Chief of Consumer and
12	Governmental Affairs. Thank you for your
13	patience this morning. We always think we are
14	going to do really well with our schedule, and
15	we never do. So we greatly appreciate your
16	patience in joining us again this morning to
17	talk about what you do on disability rights
18	with the Bureau. So thank you, Karen.
19	MS. PELTZ STRAUSS: Sure. My
20	pleasure. It is great to be back and to chat
21	with you. I think the last time that I
22	addressed you all, I was only here to talk

about the clearinghouse, which means that we have done a lot since the last time our bureau actually talked to you about disability accomplishments here at the Commission.

So there is a long list. I am going to give you an overview. Later on, Greg Hlibok will be down here to meet with the breakout session, but always feel free to contact me individually, if you need more information about any of these issues.

A lot of you around the table know these issues very well, having been very involved in the proceedings as they were making their way through the Commission.

Over the last year, we have issued a multitude -- that is the only word I can describe -- of orders and had a multitude of proceedings on disability issues, largely to implement the 21st Century Communications and Video Accessibility Act, also known as the CVAA.

Among other things, we issued

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

rules last April on the Deaf-Blind Equipment Distribution Program. In August, we issued the video description rules, which require narration, narrative descriptions of what is going on visually on a television program that are inserted into natural causes of television program, so that blind people can follow along with the program. Those were rules that reinstated rules that had been overturned by a court back in the early 2000s.

In October issued we very I think the report and comprehensive rules. order in that case is 300 pages on advanced communication services and equipment to make sure that people can access -- people with disabilities can access services and equipment that are used with the Internet, for the most part, and it is focused on communications, not video programming, so things like instant messaging, electronic mail, and interconnected and non-interconnected VOIP services equipment used with those services.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

also issued in October requiring VOIP, V-0-I-P, providers contribute to the Telecommunications Relay Service Fund. This expanded our rules. We actually already had rules in place requiring telecommunications carriers and interconnected VOIP providers to do so. expanded our rules to non-interconnected VOIP.

More recently, we issued rules requiring captions that are on television programs to be retained on those programs when they are delivered via Internet protocol. so that is a fairly substantial change.

Before, there were so such requirements, and now when people who are deaf and hard of hearing miss a television program on TV or want to see it again, if it has already had captions when it is shown on TV, those captions have to be there when they are shown on the Internet.

There are deadlines and timetables and various schedules for each of these. I

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

don't have time to go through all of them now, but there is a gradation of requirements over the next several years for each of these.

We also took some other actions as well that are not related to the CVAA. Last April we issued -- We actually are engaged in a very significant effort at the Commission to reform the way the program for video relay service is conducted. This is to try to restore and maintain the integrity of this program, to rid it of some of the fraud and abuse that it has become subject to in recent years.

So last April we issued what we call the April Fraud VRS Order. It actually covers a little bit of IP relay as well, putting into place lots of requirements and prohibitions against certain actions that are designed to minimize and eliminate fraud in that program.

In July, we also adopted new certification procedures for VRS and IP relay

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

services, again to make sure that the providers that are providing these services are doing so in full compliance with our rules, and there may be some people around the table who don't know what relay services are.

They are basically communication services that typically use a person in between the caller and the called person, and they have lots of different forms. You could have a deaf or hard of hearing person using a text device. It could either by a TTY or an Internet text device, and then that person calls the person at the other end, but a communication assistant in the middle will read what the person types and type back to that individual.

You could have video relay, as I mentioned, which is sign language interpreters where the deaf or hard of hearing or speech disabled person signs to an interpreter that is a communication assistant, and then the CA interprets what that person says to the other

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

person, and then signs back.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

There is speech to speech, that is a service that has the person in the middle converting what the individual The person might have a whisper or saying. have a stutter or a stammer or some kind of other speech disability, and may have trouble talking directly to the other individual. lot of people will hang up on people that sound different. So this person in the middle then repeats what the individual says.

Finally, there is something called caption telephone, which allows people who are typically hard of hearing and still have their voices to speak directly to the other person and to have the relay service -- well, to be able to hear with their residual hearing a little bit of what the other person is saying, but to have the relay service send back in text what that other person is saying.

Typically the CA, the communication assistant, in this case repeats

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

what the responding party is saying into a speech to text recognition program, and then that individual with the hearing disability can, when it is converted to text, read what the responding party is saying, but they can also have a direct connection and listen to what that individual is saying.

So these are some of the various VRS, TRS, caption telephone, speech -- these are some of the various programs that we implement on an ongoing basis.

We also in this past -- Oh, and I In July, we issued this am sorry. order, because certification some of these based, and services are ΙP they are regulated or certified through states, intrastate analog PSTN some of our based components of TRS do have oversight by the states, but these IP based programs, whenever relay goes over in IP form, there is no state oversight. So we are trying to step up the FCC's oversight.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

In addition to the certification order, this past December we released a Notice of Proposed Rule Making to consider changes structurally in how we reimburse VRS and also how VRS is provided. This is in addition to some of the measures we took to curb fraud, and comments are due on that this coming March 9th and the 30th, and we are hoping to get something out sometime late spring.

Very complicated issues. We are going to have to work through these issues. We don't want to rush it, but it is our goal to try to compete this proceeding in a timely fashion.

We also have a lot of work on closed captioning. We are constantly working on closed captioning issues. As I mentioned, the IP Captioning Order came out. In addition to that, we are working on a closed captioning order on quality.

That has been pending before the Commission for about seven years or so. It

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

was a result of a petition filed by consumers in 2004 out of concerns that not every channel, every network, has been producing programming with captioning quality that allows individuals to understand the content of programming.

So we are looking at ways that will be fair to both consumers and the programmers that achieve that result and achieve some consistency across programming.

We do not have a timetable for that as of yet.

We also, in October, released what is called the Anglers -- a lot of different names. It is the Anglers Reversal MO&O, Memorandum Opinion and Order, which overturned a series of exemptions that had been granted by CGB in the past that we felt had not gone through the necessary processes for reviewing exemptions.

Under our rules, an entity can petition for an exemption from the captioning rules, if they believe that they would

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

experience what is now called an economic burden or that it would be economically burdensome for them to provide captions. the time that this order -- the original order granting the exemptions granted, the was terminology was undue burden. The CVA has changed it to economically burdensome.

The results of overturning these original petitions was to have approximately 300 additional -- Originally, there were two petitions granted, two exemptions granted, but then there were approximately 300 more linked to the rationale in an original decision that had granted those two petitions.

The Commission here decided that all of them had not been reviewed appropriately and were based on an incorrect standard, and so as a consequence, reversed all of the exemptions.

We then sent out letters to each of the petitioners that had their exemptions reversed. Mind you, while their exemptions

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

were pending this entire time, they were actually getting an exemption. So there was no harm in reversing these, because what we told each one is that you may refile.

we have gotten some refiles, So and those exemptions are still pending. of these entities -- many of them are small -did not refile. So those petitions have been dismissed, and we are now continuing to make our way through several additional petitions that were filed between 2006 or 2007 -actually, some even filed before -- and now, to make sure that they are all going to be reviewed, if they are still needed, with the new standard, which is actually the original standard for determining whether or not station or a network should -- or channel or programmer should get a captioning exemption.

The short way of saying that is that we are working through our backlog of exemption requests, and we are hoping to -- We are gradually getting this under control.

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

It was mentioned before that this National Deaf-Blind Equipment have Distribution Program. We are hoping to get up and running in July. This is a phenomenal program, the first time that the Commission ever took affirmative steps to make sure that the deaf-blind population has access to equipment that is specifically designed to assist people who are deaf-blind to access communications, specifically telecommunications and advanced communication services.

We are now reviewing petitions, or rather applications, for certification by state and local programs that want to implement this program. It is basically a locally based -- The distributions will be occurring from local programs, even though we are coordinating it on a national basis.

are also looking at applications entities from that want to provide outreach for this. We have an

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

outreach component as well.

In answer to your question earlier about the inconsistency between qualification — the income qualifications between the two programs, what Rebecca explained to me — I am not as familiar with the Lifeline program as she is, but she said that, if individuals meet the guidelines for certain Federal programs like Medicaid, even if they have more income than what is specified for Lifeline, they can still qualify.

So there may be some individuals that fall between -- I think it is 135 percent for Lifeline and 400 percent -- You were right, it is 400 percent for the National Deaf-Blind Program -- they may still quality for Lifeline.

The reason that we established such a lenient, for lack of a better word, or a liberal interpretation of the income qualifications for the National Deaf-Blind Program is because we received on the record a

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

lot of information about the very high costs, medical and personal assistance costs and other costs related to being deaf-blind that were so common for deaf-blind people.

So we didn't want to exclude anybody that might have an income that is even 300 percent of the Federal poverty level, if all of their expenses are bringing them down to 100 percent of the poverty level.

So we went to 400 percent, which was what some of the state equipment distribution programs do. That was the max that we saw that some of the state equipment distributions do. so we felt comfortable using that as a cutoff.

Something else that we are very active in now is NG911. We have our Emergency Access Advisory committee, which was created under the CVAA, which conducted a survey last spring to determine the preferred methods of providing emergency access -- of using emergency access technologies for people with

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

disabilities.

That committee developed a report based on that survey, containing recommendations to the Commission. It gave us that report on December 7th, as was required by the legislation, but the committee decided to continue its work and go into more depth with respect to trying to refine what those recommendations are.

They have developed seven different subcommittees for this purpose. Just by way of example, there are committees on using text to 911, for Mobile Solutions pre-NG911, using sign language with PSAPs, TTY transition. Again, there are approximately seven committees.

We are hosting -- You may be interested in knowing this. At the end of March, on March 28th and 29th, we are hosting an exhibition fair here at the Commission where we will be having on display and having demos of proposed interim text to 911

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

solutions, again pre-the full blown NG911.

The reason that we are hosting it then is because this is on the tails of NENA's -- the National Emergency Number Association's "911 Goes to Washington." Then also on the 30th, the VPAAC will be having one of its committee meetings.

So it is going to be 911 week, basically, and we understand that there is another demo happening on the 26th. So if you are interested in 911, this is the place to be.

things The other that working on are the accessibility clearinghouse. Again, we talked to you about that last time. We just wanted to let you know that we are still working on it actively. We have meetings on it, it seems like, every day. We are concerned. We are not getting a lot of hits on it yet. Clearly, we need to do outreach.

We are required by the Act to do

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

outreach, and we are working on improvements. We are very excited. We think it is a great clearinghouse, and we are looking forward to working with this community and others to make sure that this does reach the intended population.

The next thing is HAC, Hearing Aid Compatibility. We haven't released a whole bunch in that area for a while, but we do have pending some new standards, and we also have pending a rule making to make sure that equipment use with Advanced Communication Services are also hearing aid compatible, and we are expecting that the Wireless Bureau will be working on that again in the coming months.

Finally, what is left is the VPAAC, Video Programming Access the Accessibility Advisory Committee, which is the other CVAA advisory committee that was created, is working on three remaining issues, and they have to deliver reports to us in April emergency on making sure that

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

information provided on television programming is accessible to blind people, making sure that the equipment used for video programming can convey that emergency information, and also that that equipment can convey -- that that equipment has user interfaces that are accessible to people with disabilities, including accessing volume control, changing channels, menu guides.

Very difficult right now for a blind person to navigate those types of interfaces and controls on a television, and finally making sure that this equipment can pass through or render video description.

So there is still a tremendous amount of work being done by that committee that will be coming to us in April, and then we have another 12 to 18 months, depending on the issue, to issue rules.

The other thing that is happening that still is pending is the Advanced Communication Services item. Even though we

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

issued rules in October, there are some pieces left out, and we have to complete those with respect to -- The issues that are outstanding are browsers on mobile phones, video conferencing, and a small business exemption, among others.

So we received comments on this, I think, February 13th. I think the replies are still due by March 12th or 14th -- 12th? I have the 14th, but in any case, they are due mid-March. Then we are going to start looking at those, and that is another proceeding that we are going to have.

Finally, we just last week or the week before issued a Public Notice seeking comment on IP relay. It was a refresh notice to follow up on a Notice of Proposed Rule Making that we issued. I think it was in 2006, asking about measures that we can take to curb fraud and abuse of IP relay, again.

Unfortunately, although these are programs designed to assist relay users, they

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	have become subject to abuse that had not been
2	anticipated when they were first created. So
3	we are trying to crack down on that.
4	So that is it, and I know that you
5	are tired. I am tired from going through
6	this, and I know that you don't have a whole
7	lot of time. I don't know if you want to take
8	questions, if you have any questions now or
9	you want to bring them up during the
10	disabilities section and just take your break
11	now. Any questions?
12	CHAIR BERLYN: If you have time
13	for a couple of questions, if anyone does have
14	a couple of questions. Paul?
15	MR. SCHROEDER: Paul Schroeder,
16	American Foundation for the Blind. I will
17	just ask you, Karen, that same question I just
18	asked about Lifeline and equipment.
19	Is this something that could be
20	dealt with by the Commission to ensure that
21	people who have access to handsets under the

new Lifeline requirements can, in fact, find

handsets that are accessible for people with disabilities, because it is at that low end of the equipment that people have had the most trouble finding accessible handsets?

MS. PELTZ STRAUSS: I wasn't here when you asked the first question. So I am not sure what it is predicated on, but I do know that you are right, that there are issues, especially for the blind community that there are significant problems with being able to find lower end phones, because it is the higher end phones that tend to have the accessibility.

The only thing that I could suggest is that I will talk to Kim about this and confer with the Wireline Bureau to see whether there is something that can be worked out, but I can tell you that it is something that really does concern us.

We hosted some events here, some workshops, to address that, and we just continue to encourage individuals to feel free

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

to file complaints when they see phones that are not accessible, and we will try to address those that way.

Basically, Section 255 of the Communications Act and now Section 716 are both complaint driven. So 716, which is the Advanced Communication Services — filing complaints for those has not gone into effect yet, but many of the phones that you are talking about are still under 255.

CHAIR BERLYN: Does anyone else have a question for Karen? Karen, thank you so much. Your work is exhaustive and exhausting. We really appreciate your being here. You have done so much at the Commission and at the Bureau, and we greatly appreciate your coming and talking to us again.

MS. PELTZ STRAUSS: It is my pleasure, and I just want to say that, clearly, because I am here, I get the credit, but it is not only me. Obviously, there are teams and teams, multiple teams, of people

1	around the agency that have spent hours on
2	weekends, evenings, given many, many hours of
3	their free time to meet these high deadlines
4	imposed by the CVAA, and to achieve these
5	other goals.
6	So whenever I get the chance, I
7	thank those individuals, because they have
8	been absolutely extraordinary. So it has been
9	very, very gratifying, being able to work with
10	all of these individuals and to watch this
11	administration's commitment to making sure
12	that these issues get addressed in a timely
13	fashion.
14	Thank you as well for all of your
15	input.
16	CHAIR BERLYN: Thanks, Karen. So
17	here is what we are going to do. We are going
18	to take a much needed break. It will be a
19	real break and a phone break.
20	I know that Betty is out front

a look at your agenda with me.

waiting to receive lunch for us all. So take

21

22

What we are

going to do is we are going to shuffle it a little bit.

I do feel like the roundtable discussion is important, and I want to do that before we break into our working groups, so that working groups can discuss any of the issues that are brought up during the roundtable discussion.

So what we are going to do is we are going to take our break. Hopefully,. after we take a break and check our email and make any phone calls we want to make, that will time us well with lunch appearing, magically appearing, on the table over here, which it has not yet.

Then we will take a real, true lunch break here in the room and another little network break. That will take us to about 12:15. Then at 12:15, we are going to have our roundtable discussion from 12:15 to 12:45, and then we are going to do our breakout sessions from 12:45 to 1:45. Scott

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

will tell us where those rooms will be.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Scott asked our working chairs which working groups wanted to have breakout sessions. I think the Media Group has already done a meeting. So they are not going to have a breakout session. I know the USF Working Group does want to have breakout. I think the Broadband Working Group Is that right? Okay. is going to meet. Disability Group is going to meet here. know that.

Ed, what about the Consumer? You are going to have a brief meeting. So you may go meet, and then join one of the other working groups. Great. Excellent.

So after our roundtable discussion, Scott will give us the different room numbers so that we don't forget them between now and the breakout, because I know I would.

So let's take a break and then stay in the room for lunch, and then we will

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	have our roundtable discussion at around
2	12:15.
3	Thanks, everybody. This has been
4	a great morning.
5	(Whereupon, the foregoing matter
6	went off the record at 11:35 a.m. and resumed
7	at 12:18 p.m.)
8	CHAIR BERLYN: Okay. We are going
9	to get started again. To keep us on schedule,
10	we are going to start our roundtable
11	discussion.
12	So what I want to do with this
13	time that we have before our roundtable
14	discussion is to give everyone an opportunity
15	to raise any issues that you have heard about
16	this morning, as well as raise any other
17	issues that you have thought about that you
18	think the Consumer Advisory committee should
19	address that we haven't yet talked about, so
20	that we can assign those issues to working
21	groups to talk about today and going forward.

Before we do that, I just want to

mention two issues that speakers this morning talked about that we will, hopefully, work on going forward. One, Kris Monteith and Bill Freedman talked about, which is getting our feedback on the complaint process.

So I will be getting a little bit more information from the Bureau staff about what they are looking for from us, and then we will set up some sort of process for working on that for them. We will find out a little bit more about what kind of feedback, in particular, they want from the CAC, what would be most helpful, and then we will figure out a process for going forward there.

about this morning was from Kim Scardino. She said that she would appreciate some feedback on outreach efforts that they could undertake for reaching consumers and educating them about the new Lifeline rules, and providing information for consumers about that. So I think that would be another good one.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

our USF Working Group to start off in talking about that. So perhaps you can talk about that today in your working group, and bring that back to the full CAC today, if you want to talk about that a little bit with us, and about the process that you will take on thinking about that, if there are other CAC members who might want to participate in that.

Those are two things I heard this morning, but now I would like to open it up to all of you to other thoughts you have on this morning's discussion and other issues. So anyone want to kick it off? Barry? Please, tent cards and hand raising, and then pull the mike close.

MR. UMANSKY: Thanks, Debbie. As you know, I have been uncharacteristically silent so far today. What I want to do before you guys break out in the working groups is to have you think about something, and we are going to have a further discussion with the

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

Media Working Group dialogue, our presentation, right after the breakouts.

We talked a lot about disclosure so far today, disclosure of information to consumers. Today, right now, in front of the Supreme Court there is a protest going on dealing with what they call Citizens United 2, a Supreme Court decision tossing out a state requirement of placing limitations on corporate campaign funds going into candidates and the independent groups.

course, you know about Citizens United case. There is nothing the FCC can do to overturn а Supreme decision. There is nothing, really, Congress can do either to overturn a Supreme decision, but decision, Court that the Regional Citizens United, even the one today, suggested that voters, consumers, would have full access to information as to who is trying to persuade them. But the way the FCC has been interpreting a longstanding provision of

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

the Communications Act, Section 317, has really failed to provide that kind of disclosure.

The FCC made the judgment years ago, well before we had the onslaught of millions and millions of dollars from all kind of groups that it would not normally require piercing the veil, although it says it was essentially a shell organization that would be signing a check for the medium of communications who run the ad.

Only a couple of times in the most extraordinary circumstances has the FCC required that the actual fronters of the money be disclosed to the audience, be disclosed to the viewing or listening public.

Well, I have talked to many of the people in the Media Working Group, and in our presentation later today, and in formal recommendations we will have in June, we want to have a recommendation that the FCC, on its own and also in a recommendation to Congress -

- and we have already established at the last meeting that one provision of the Communications Act requires that the FCC let Congress know periodically what kind of legislative changes might be made to help it fulfill its mission.

Bobby Baker was supposed to have been here late this morning to talk about these issues. He is not around. A couple of things we were going to recommend to Bobby is that they issue public notices explaining again to consumers what the heck is going on here.

Number two: To explain to all advertisers, not just broadcasters -- I'm sorry, to all media, not just broadcasters, the consequences of running spots that may be misleading. More importantly, we were going to urge, and we will mention this again this afternoon -- There has been a petition pending at the FCC for about 10 months. Not I don't think everybody necessarily embraces every

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

part of it, but it would require that the FCC take a second look at how it is implementing a Federal statute that would require that people like you and me know who is trying to persuade them in commercial advertising, including political spots.

There is also a bill on Capitol Hill recently introduced, H.R. 4010. It is our proposal. Our Media Working Group urged the FCC to embrace those concepts, to start its own internal proceeding, and to kind of raise the dialogue on what can be done under existing and proposed legislation to cure this problem. More details at 1:45, I believe. Thank you.

CHAIR BERLYN: A couple of things,
Barry. First of all, Barry mentioned Bobby
Baker of the FCC, and just to let everybody
know, Scott invited Bobby Baker to come and
speak today, and he definitely wanted to be
here, and he had a family member who had
surgery today. So, unfortunately, he had to

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	be out of town for that reason. So it is not
2	out of lack of wanting to be here.
3	So I just wanted to mention that.
4	Thank you, Barry, for teeing that issue up,
5	and we will look forward to more to come.
6	MR. UMANSKY: By the way, a
7	footnote to history. Bobby Baker and I
8	started out I was an FCC attorney for seven
9	years. We started the very same day. We were
LO	fingerprinted together as we started our
11	Federal employment back then. Thank you.
12	CHAIR BERLYN: Thanks. Mitsy.
13	MS. HERRERA: Good afternoon. Two
L4	things. One is I wanted to shamelessly just
L4 L5	things. One is I wanted to shamelessly just
L 4	things. One is I wanted to shamelessly just take advantage of the fact that there were so
L4 L5 L6	things. One is I wanted to shamelessly just take advantage of the fact that there were so many of our partners from the deaf and hard of
L4 L5 L6 L7	things. One is I wanted to shamelessly just take advantage of the fact that there were so many of our partners from the deaf and hard of hearing community in the room to alert them to
L4 L5 L6 L7	things. One is I wanted to shamelessly just take advantage of the fact that there were so many of our partners from the deaf and hard of hearing community in the room to alert them to there is a piece of proposed Maryland
L4 L5 L6 L7	things. One is I wanted to shamelessly just take advantage of the fact that there were so many of our partners from the deaf and hard of hearing community in the room to alert them to there is a piece of proposed Maryland legislation which has a hearing on March 9th

taxes in Maryland. The state fund which finances the relay services for telephone services for the deaf will run out of money in the end of FY '13, and if the tax moratorium goes into place, they will have no means to enact some new funding mechanism.

So if any of you are interested in that, if you could just see me, and I will just separately give you information about that. I am trying to find some people from the deaf and hard of hearing community to come and testify. That is a Friday, March 9th, in Annapolis. That is at 1:00 p.m.

The other issue I wanted to ask generally in the CCAC is whether it should be part of the General Disabilities Working Group or whether a subgroup should be focused particularly on video issues.

The one, in particular, that has been raised a lot in the last couple of meetings is closed captioning. There is a lot of information and new things that are coming

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	out there, and frankly, the FCC is not really
2	keeping up on some of those.
3	So I want to know I see Julie
4	is not back yet whether there was some
5	interest in specifically focusing on video
6	issues, because a lot of what we deal with are
7	dealing with handsets, phonesets, and really
8	sort of focusing on television sets and video
9	communications.
10	CHAIR BERLYN: I am turning to
11	Lise and Paul and our Disability Paul, do
12	you want to address that?
13	MR. SCHROEDER: I think we have
14	had several conversations in the Disability
15	Work Group This is Paul Schroeder with AFB
16	about closed captioning issues and some of
17	the pending petitions at the FCC.
18	Some of the video work, of course,
19	is under review and rule making or about to
20	be, and some of it is under the VPAAC, Video
21	Program Access Advisory Committee. So as I

recall, we were instructed or encouraged to

not take up some of those issues that were under another FCC Advisory Committee's area, at least for the moment.

As Karen mentioned, that report will be issued in a couple of months, and then a rule making will commence on those issues.

Just while I have got the mike, I was going to raise a similar point, though, because I think one of the issues that we haven't really discussed as a committee here, and I don't know that we have heard from folks in media to talk about -- There is a whole raft of issues around television and video, and Barry just mentioned one, and I know his group has been working on a couple of others, but there are many others that I think we shy away from as consumer advocates sometimes talking about television very much.

This is true, I think, for the blindness community, but it might be true for the general consumer advocacy community, because we don't think television is very

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

important, other than the fact that it is the hugest media that people spend most of their time with. So we don't think it is important, because it is trash, but it is where people spend a lot of time.

Anyway, I have a lot of concerns about the consumer access, open initiatives effort for people to get access to media outside of the traditional means and channels, opening up cable and other systems so that people can have competitive equipment, those kinds of issues, some of which, I know, are being adjudicated or heard by the Commission and some of which are long time challenges up here.

So the direct answer to your question, Mitsy: Absolutely, I think video is within the Disability Work Group's area. We are looking at some of the issues. Some, we will probably look at in more detail as the Video Program Advisory Committee's work ends, and we may look at some of those issues and

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

see what we would want to bring to the Consumer Committee.

Then I think, as I said, while I have got the microphone, I think there is a whole host of broader media issues around TV and consumer access to equipment and controls and issues that I would love to see us wrestle with.

CHAIR BERLYN: Lise.

MS. HAMLIN: If I could add to that, we will be looking at captioning issues, and we have been, again to the extent that it doesn't overlap with CVAA. But if other people are seeing trends or issues that we miss, because that could certainly happen, and you could see something locally that you are beginning to see and want, I would really any from anybody welcome input committee who saw things that we should be picking up that our group hasn't seen.

CHAIR BERLYN: Steve.

MR. POCIASK: Steve Pociask,

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

American Consumer Institute. I think there is an issue that we may want to consider going forward dealing with online consumer privacy. There has been a number of incidences over the last few years that sort of exposed consumer information to the public, the collection of WiFi information, medical records that are downloaded without consumers' information.

The latest example is Google's work-around that undid the default settings for Apple users, effectively collecting information that they chose not to collect. Essentially, it is sort of a work-around hack, if you will.

Ι think there should be some expression of outrage for what has happened or the Federal statement maybe to Trade Commission or to Congress to look further into this, because my fear is some of these abuses in the end, create might, some onerous regulation on the industry which we may not

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

need, because there is a lot of good behavior going on.

It is just a series of incidences that have happened by a collection of few that we need to be aware of. This is people's personal information, and while, in exchange for that information, some people are getting very useful services, we need to be aware that, when this information is taken without the consumer's consent, that it is theft, and we should be outraged by that.

Another example was location information was put online where people could see where they were located. So this is an ongoing problem that we are having, and I think it is something that we should have some sort of group expression of outrage for. Thank you.

CHAIR BERLYN: I think it is a very interesting issue. It is certainly very timely with the White House recent White House proposal that came out. It might be what I

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

would say -- and I am not sure what working 1 2 group to put this in, but it might be helpful 3 to have someone come and talk about the 4 jurisdictional issues with the FCC and the FTC, because so much of this falls within the 5 6 jurisdiction of the FTC. So it might be interesting to find 7 8 9

out what jurisdiction the FCC has on online privacy issues, so that we could then find out how we could -- where we could be helpful in terms of an advisory role. I think that that might be helpful, perhaps at our next meeting, to have someone come and talk about it. But, yes, a really timely and important issue for consumers. Thanks, Steve.

One other thing that -- I will turn to you next, Art, and then I will speak.

Go ahead.

MR. NEILL: Art Neill from Utility
Consumers Action Network in San Diego.

Just as a follow-up on the online privacy side of things: Besides the White

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

House announcing their privacy bill of rights, there is also in California an effort that, just in the last two days, the Attorney General, Paul Harris, has taken with a number of the Google, Apple, other Silicon Valley companies, regarding online privacy. So you might also keep an eye on that.

Two issues I iust wanted to mention. I was going to mention this when Bill Freedman was talking. Number one is: You can as a group that deals directly with consumers and helps them resolve disputes with companies seize this issue of getting individual complaints to the point of understanding trends that are going on.

There is a disconnect there. There are a couple of ways, I think, that you can deal with that. In California, we actually have a monthly meeting, for instance, with the Consumer Advisory Bureau of the California Public Utilities Commission to talk about some of the issues that are going on.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

That is something new that has developed there.

I think that, while it is great to have openness and transparency, what the FCC is finding, it is also good to hear from some of these groups. I am sure there are other groups in the room that speak to consumers directly, and to be able to communicate some of the trends that we are seeing and turning those individual trends, instead one-off situations where people are refunded five dollars or they have their situation fixed, to help the other.

You know, when you see five or 10 people, there is usually hundreds or thousands that are affected, and getting to that point of systematic fixing is something that we are really interested in. So we would want to work with Bill and anyone else who is willing to get better access to that information.

The second -- I had one other issue that I wanted to mention, and I will

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

have to come back to it, I guess.

CHAIR BERLYN: Okay. Good suggestion. One thing that I wanted -Another thing that I wanted to just respond to is the whole Connect to Compete question and where we fit into this. I know that the Broadband Working Group recommended that we have someone come and talk at this meeting to update us on the Connect to Compete from One Economy. So I just wanted to respond to that.

We did have someone scheduled to come from One Economy at this meeting, and that didn't happen at the last minute, and there is a commitment from One Economy to come to our next meeting. So we will have someone come to our next meeting.

The CAC does have a role that Kris asked Josh a question about. In the National Broadband Plan, there is language in there that says that the FCC should develop a partnership to promote broadband adoption. So this partnership was not named, of course. It

was an idea in the National Broadband Plan, but the first step of that is this Connect to Compete.

It says in there that this partnership -- that several things should happen. One thing that should happen is that the Consumer Advisory Committee should help monitor this partnership. So we do have a role to play in monitoring the progress of Connect to Compete.

so what does that mean? We are not 100 percent sure exactly what that means, but it means that we need to see what is going on, and progress is being made, and have folks come in and talk to us about it, and ourselves make any recommendations we may want directly to the partnership, One Economy, and also we can to the FCC as well.

So we will do that, and I think what we are finding right now is -- and I know that we have some of the -- We have the cable partners who are involved as part of the CAC,

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

but this is really in the very early stages of development.

Connect to Compete is iust organizing and getting going and working toward a kickoff to time with the start of the school year, 2012 school year. So they are really putting this altogether now, and so there really -- you know, the progress is --It is better served for them to come and talk to us about what is happening at our next meeting, and we will talk about when that next meeting will be in June, but we will talk about that later.

That is what is going on. So I just wanted to mention that.

I see your card go up. Does anyone want to respond to Connect to Compete before I leave that? Okay. Yes, several people, because I saw cards go up before I started talking. So I wasn't sure.

I think Amalia's card went up first, and Barry's did. So, Amalia, go ahead.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

MS. DELONEY: Just quickly on the Connect to Compete piece. You know, we have a lot of interest in following it through and taking a more rigorous look at some of the issues that we hear are being raised.

To that end, I would also request that we share the information of surveys that were done by a group from Philadelphia called Action United. It is a survey from a community based organization that looks at Connect to Compete and some of the challenges they were seeing among their members.

online, and I can certainly share the link with people here, but I think as we look at bringing in people to advise the committee or talk to us both about the pros and the cons or -- cons isn't the right word -- the great things that are happening with the program and some of the very real barriers and challenges people are facing, it would be important to think about how we could include the voices of

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	Action United; because to date they have done
2	the only sort of community driven
3	participatory action research survey I know
4	about real people who are facing issues with
5	subscribing.
6	CHAIR BERLYN: Thank you. That
7	would be great to have that link so we can
8	send that around to the CAC.
9	MR. SCHROEDER: Please ask people
10	to remember to state their names.
11	CHAIR BERLYN: Yes. That was
12	Amalia. If you could, Amalia, you can send
13	that directly to the CAC, so everybody could
14	take a look at that survey, that would be
15	great.
16	MS. HAMLIN: Perfect. Then I have
17	one more question, but I can wait after people
18	finish.
19	CHAIR BERLYN: Other comments on
20	the Connect to Compete? Barry and then mark.
21	MR. UMANSKY: This is Barry
22	Umansky, Digital Policy Institute. Really, an

offer.

Yesterday evening, Dr. Yadon and I had dinner with Kelly Dunn, who had been one of the key people, and still is, with Connect to Compete, very much involved with One Economy, and he is continuing to be an advisor to that group and will continue to be integrally involved with Connect to Compete.

He has offered to speak to our plenary group, to working groups, to be on conference calls, and to help with the assessment of metrics on how the process is going.

He is a tremendous resource. I strongly suggest we take advantage of his offer to give us guidance, direction, and some good information as well.

CHAIR BERLYN: Thanks, Barry.

Josh also mentioned Nicol Turner-Lee, who is with the Joint Center for Political and Economic Studies, who has responsibility to collect the metrics for Connect to Compete.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	So we probably will want her to come and talk
2	at some point. They have done amazing work on
3	broadband adoption. So I think she would be
4	an excellent resource as well. Mark?
5	MR. DEFALCO: Mark Defalco with
6	the Appalachian Regional Commission.
7	I am disappointed that somebody
8	from Connect to Compete could not make it. I
9	mean, we gave them a substantial warning. It
10	would have been good if they could have been
11	here, but a broader issue that, I think, is
12	all relative to this.
13	The working group, the Broadband
14	Working Group, has spent a lot of time talking
15	about the Connect to Compete process, talking
16	about the Comcast process in terms of trying
17	to get the adoption out there, and the
18	adoption for the free school lunch program.
19	So when Josh was here, he had
20	mentioned the two significant things that the
21	Chairman was trying to do right now relative

to broadband, and it was access and adoption.

We as a committee really can't do a whole lot with the access issue, other than kind of say that we would like everybody to have access, try to make access ubiquitous, but we all understand the problems in terms of financing, access into very rural areas.

So that becomes а very biq you stumbling block. Then turn to the adoption issue, and the adoption seems to be where the Commission is putting а attention, and it certainly is where administration has put а lot of attention through the dollars that were put out through the stimulus program, through the BTOP program particular from NTIA, trying to communities put in broadband adoption processes and best practices and things like that.

So there are some models out there that I think maybe could be useful. One thing that I am struggling with myself, as well as our group is struggling with, is trying to say

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

what role do we really have in this adoption effort. It just seems like the FCC has said, okay, we are going to create a spin-off or the nonprofit Connect to Compete to take this role of trying to work through the adoption issue.

They have done a wonderful job in terms of trying to get together some very good partners to help them do what they are doing, and we talked about the metrics a little bit, and what do we put in place to try to monitor what they doing and make midstream are corrections if things are not doing the best things they could be doing, but then it seems like there is another party that is being brought in to monitor the metrics.

So I am struggling, trying to figure out what role do we really -- what role should we be playing in this, especially since the FCC has taken this issue and given it to a third party, and then the third party has gone to a fourth party for the metrics part of this.

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

So I don't know. We are spending an awful lot of time on this, and maybe we shouldn't be. Maybe we should be spending our time doing something else. So a little direction, I think, would be really good right now.

CHAIR BERLYN: Anyone else on Connect to Compete? I have Mitsy. Okay.

MS. HERRERA: I agree with Mark, that some direction would be good and getting feedback, but I would actually ask. We have the folks from Connect to Compete here. Could we also get somebody from NTIA, particularly their sustainable broadband adoption; because one thing I do think that we can bring to the table is the glaring lack of coordination between Federal agencies that are working on the same issue.

The fact that Josh works in the Chairman's office and says that they don't know about any of these programs, and NTIA has compiled, I think, a big database of some of

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	these local programs So one of the things I
2	think we can bring to the table is helping to
3	get these government agencies to talk to each
4	other.
5	So I would ask, if we can, and we
6	have the Connect to Compete people, could we
7	also get somebody from NTIA?
8	CHAIR BERLYN: What I would
9	suggest is that the Broadband Working Group
10	talk about that. Okay. Amalia, I think you
11	said you had another thought.
12	MS. DELONEY: This is Amalia,
13	Center for Media Justice. I am not sure that
14	this is the right place, but I thought I would
15	raise it, because there is interest, at least
16	from several of us here.
17	We are working with communities
18	across the country on the issue of the cost of
19	prison phone calls, particularly the
20	exorbitant cost that is borne by the family
21	members who have folks who are incarcerated,
22	either in jails or prisons or through

immigrant detention.

This is something where there has been a petition in front of the FCC for over 12 years. It is an issue that is bubbling up again. There is impact at the Federal levels, state level, and municipal level. It is a consumer issue, more so tied to phones than it is to broadbands.

I would at least like to raise the issue and hear from people whether or not there is space at this table to talk about these sorts of things, given the fact that at least several groups here are actively engaged in this issue.

CHAIR BERLYN: Is there anyone who wants to respond to that issue? Art?

MR. NEILL: Just for what it is worth, UCAN has done a number of individual cases where there are lots of issues, as you say, because there is monopolies given to carriers in the prisons. So there is a lot of abuse that takes place anytime you have a

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	total monopoly.
2	We have cases and probably stories
3	to share, and ways of solving individual
4	problems, as well as identifying trends.
5	CHAIR BERLYN: We are just
6	chatting to see if that falls within any of
7	the areas of our working group, and I am
8	having a hard time sort of figuring out what
9	it falls under. Yes?
10	There is a petition pending, you
11	said? You said there is something pending at
12	the FCC on this?
13	MS. DELONEY: There has been a
14	petition in front of the FCC for, I believe,
15	12 years.
16	CHAIR BERLYN: You know, an
17	organization that might have an interest in
18	that, and they are not here today, is NASUCA.
19	So unfortunately, their representative is not
20	here today. Lawrence, are you on the phone,
21	by any chance? No. Ken?
22	MR. McELDOWNEY: I think one thing

that might be interesting to do would be for the CAC to come up with a list of petitions that have been sitting at the FCC for years, and then get someone to come from the Commission to sort of address those.

There is no excuse for something lasting 12 years, much less 12 weeks -- I mean 12 weeks, much less 12 years. That is just inexcusable. My guess is it is sort of lost in some dusty drawer somewhere.

CHAIR BERLYN: It is a good idea.

Sounds like a good way to address it. Yes?

Mitsy?

MS. HERRERA: I am sorry. Just to follow up to that, I believe that there was a report that they had to do for Congress. It probably would have been within the last year, which noted the backlog of FCC petitions that they have failed to take action on. I would note that for my brethren out there in the public educational government access community.

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	They have had one about the
2	failure for people to get local to get AT&T
3	to carry local public educational and
4	government access petitions, and it has been
5	sitting at the FCC for over three years. It
6	is a widespread problem, particularly when the
7	FCC is confronted with a difficult issue.
8	CHAIR BERLYN: I think we have the
9	start of some good thinking about this. So
10	let me think about how we sort of move this
11	forward, but it is a good idea, yes. Ed?
12	MR. BARTHOLME: I was just going
13	to piggyback off of that and say
14	CHAIR BERLYN: Oh, Ed, identify
15	yourself. Sorry.
16	MR. BARTHOLME: I am Ed Bartholme
17	with Call for Action.
18	In addition to some follow-up on
19	some of those things, the CAC in various
20	iterations has made a number of
21	recommendations to the FCC, and I don't
22	believe we have ever really gotten a formal

report back on any of the recommendations that we have made.

So even from an "in our own house" standpoint, it would be nice to have somebody just come and address some of the things that we have put before the Commission over the years. For one, there are new people at the table who don't realize the things that we have already acted on as a group or not necessarily even when I was part of the group, but that the group has already acted on.

So it would be nice to know where those things sit and where they might be going, so that that way we can better focus our energy and effort, so that we are not duplicating effort and covering the same issues again, especially if there is just no interest in the Commission actually doing anything about our suggestions.

MR. UMANSKY: This is Barry Umansky. I guess, in partial defense of the FCC, there was an original plan to have a

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	report back on one of our Media Working Group
2	and full CAC recommendations on evaluation of
3	the national EAS test.
4	As it turns out, that person is
5	not here now, but there was definitely an
6	effort to at least respond to one. There was
7	a conflict or
8	CHAIR BERLYN: Scott is going to
9	respond. Scott, mike.
10	MR. MARSHALL: This is Scott
11	Marshall. We did invite Tom Beers who spoke
12	to us last time. Actually, he has been here a
13	couple of times, from the Public Safety and
14	Homeland Security Bureau. He wrote me
15	yesterday and said there is some data that
16	they now have. It is being reviewed, and I
17	believe he indicated that he would be briefing
18	the Chairman about it, and I know he is
19	interested in coming back in June, because we
20	talked about it.
21	CHAIR BERLYN: Okay. So getting

back to -- Thank you, Scott. Getting back to

1	Ed's point, I think it is a great one. We
2	make great recommendations. What happens to
3	them? We have seen To give ourselves some
4	credit, we have seen our recommendations
5	appear in orders, like Lifeline is a great
6	example, USF.
7	So we should give ourselves that
8	credit. So that is enough of a validation
9	there, that there is something that happens
10	with our recommendations, but it is not a bad
11	idea for us to do a little bit of a check once
12	in a while with the Commission and say, hey,
13	what is going on with some of our
14	recommendations.
15	MR. BARTHOLME: I think we should
16	skip the DTV ones, though.
17	CHAIR BERLYN: I think we can skip
18	that, yes, which was the focus of a lot of our
19	work in 2007 to 2009. Yes.
20	Okay, we are going to wrap this up
21	in just a minute, but, Ken, you want to have a

last comment here?

1	MR. BARTHOLME: Yes. I was going
2	to say that I think one of the advantages of
3	getting feedback as opposed to just
4	recognition for the recommendations is that,
5	from the feedback, we could find out whether
6	or not they didn't quite understand the
7	recommendations or whether or not there is
8	additional information we can provide.
9	So I think it is not just the
10	recognition. I think it is being able to

So I think it is not just the recognition. I think it is being able to really sort of follow through on the recommendations that we make.

any other final issues, comments. If you haven't gotten an opportunity to speak about your important issue, now is the time to do it. We are going to send off the -- Is that a hand up, or no? That was a sort of hand up. Name and hand up for the mike?

MR. BAKER: Chris Baker, AARP. We had talked about the FCC website in a number of our different groups, and we are interested

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

in having someone from the FCC come talk to us. The speaker earlier this morning addressed the complaints aspect of it, but I can't remember. What is sort of the next steps on that and what we were thinking about?

CHAIR BERLYN: Scott?

MR. MARSHALL: This is Scott Marshall. Yes, we had invited, as it turned out, our Managing Director, David Robbins, to this meeting. Unfortunately, he could not make it, but he did indicate to me on the phone day before yesterday that he would be willing to come to us again or even come to a working group meeting, if you wanted to have an initial discussion so that you could get the ball rolling before the June meeting.

So I think my suggestion would be give me a couple of dates, and I will get back to him and see if we can facilitate that, if you want to meet at the working group level.

Otherwise, we can have him in June, too.

CHAIR BERLYN: Go ahead.

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	MR. BAKER: Because June is the
2	next meeting date?
3	CHAIR BERLYN: Yes. We might as
4	well mention that now. We have identified a
5	date in June, a date. We are keeping our
6	fingers crossed, when this room is available.
7	June is the next time we thought we would
8	meet before we get into the time of the
9	summer, which is always difficult for folks.
10	So Scott checked into the
11	availability of the Commission Meeting Room
12	and checked conferences for all the
13	organizations that sit on the CAC.
14	So the available date is June
15	15th, which is a Friday, which we know is
16	usually a little bit easier for folks. So
17	that is the proposed next meeting date for the
18	CAC. Hopefully, it is not hitting during a
19	vacation day for you all, or vacation week.
20	So that is when we are proposing
21	to meet again. I think, in terms of the
22	website and having him speak, it might be a

good idea to pull him into a working group conference call, so that you can make an early determination whether or not he needs to come to talk to the full CAC.

MR. BAKER: Did we decide which working that was? I know there was some talk about it in the Consumer Group. We have talked about it in the Broadband Group, but I don't know.

CHAIR BERLYN: I think it is the Consumer Group, I think, is the appropriate working group. But these working groups are open, and so, Ed, if it is okay with you to have the Consumer Working Group handle that issue, but to make sure that folks know; because the website does touch everybody, and others might be interested.

MR. MARSHALL: I am sure I must have said this at one time or another, but if I didn't, I apologize. Any of you can post a message on our robot mailing list to the entire committee. You can also post a message

to your own working group of which you are a member, and we also have a leadership group which consists of the chairs of the working groups that meet once a month via phone, and we also have a leadership list as well that the leaders can post to.

So please free to use any of those vehicles to help cross-fertilize, if you will, the work of the various groups and, if there are any other good ways of doing that, I would be happy to help try to facilitate it.

CHAIR BERLYN: Fernando is going to make a comment. We will make that the last one around the room, and then I do want to check and see if anyone on the phone -- hopefully, there are folks there -- if anyone on the phone wants to comment. Fernando?

MR. LAGUARDA: Fernando Laguarda,
Time-Warner Cable. This is more of an
announcement, but Scott reminded me of the
importance of making the announcement.

The Telecommunications Policy

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

Research Conference, which is the leading conference for academic work in the telecommunications space, is having its 40th annual conference at George Mason University this fall.

The deadline for submissions of abstracts for papers for the conference is March 31st. I will circulate the information on how to submit, but the website is tprc.org I will circulate -- tprcweb.com -- sorry. that to the group, but I wanted to make the since the deadline will take announcement place before we meet again, but it is an important conference and a great opportunity to submit papers, research papers of interest to the academic community, and I would bring that to your attention. Thanks.

CHAIR BERLYN: Thanks, Fernando.

Does anyone on the phone want to offer any comments? We do have someone who is checking Facebook and is supposed to communicate with us.

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	By the way, if anyone wants to
2	Tweet from here, our hash tag, apparently, is
3	fcclive. We didn't have any this morning,
4	and they are supposed to keep us informed. So
5	we will let you know.
6	MR. MARSHALL: We are not planning
7	on interrupting the consideration of the
8	recommendations and your reports back with
9	questions.

CHAIR BERLYN: Hopefully, we will get people more engaged in this process going forward.

MR. MARSHALL: The Tweeting and the Facebook is new for us. I think it is pretty new for any of the Advisory Committees, and that is something that will be done with all of the Advisory Committees, as I understand it, and although the existence of this meeting was Tweeted all week, I am sure there are other ways of publicizing that that we need to explore.

I had a volunteer that was ready

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

to give us the questions here in the room today, and he and I will be meeting with our new media team folks to see going forward if we could make it -- stir the pot, if you will, to try to get more public participation via questions.

CHAIR BERLYN: I think, Scott, probably the best way for us to get the word out -- I don't know how many of you around the room participate in Tweet. I do. else? Right. So if each of us could do it in the days leading up to the FCC meeting and just say, hey, you know, we have got meeting, and these are some of the issues we are going to talk about, I think that might stimulate some interest, because we all have I think that is another way to do followers. it. So I will keep that in mind for our next meeting, and I think that will help.

MR. MARSHALL: And I can put a reminder in the advance materials or something like that, too, or post to the list.

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	CHAIR BERLYN: So this is a little
2	too early. I didn't think about it, but I
3	think that is a way to generate some interest.
4	Yes, Mitsy? A final comment?
5	MS. HERRERA: Yes. I just want to
6	ask quickly, because I did actually send out
7	some Tweets during that meeting. Is the FCC
8	at @fcc or are they at @fcc.gov? Which is
9	their actually Tweet?
LO	CHAIR BERLYN: I don't know.
11	MR. MARSHALL: I'm sorry, but I
L2	will let you know.
13	CHAIR BERLYN: You didn't pick it
L4	up on your
15	MS. HERRERA: I got two. I just
16	thought, if you want to follow or send stuff
L7	to them, they have got two listed, and the dot
18	is spelled out. It @fccdotgov.
L9	CHAIR BERLYN: I don't know.
20	MR. MARSHALL: I think I know the
21	answer to that question. I asked that
22	question one time, and I was told that they

spelled out the dot so that robots couldn't capture and use the data or use the address inappropriately. I think that is the reason.

The address is actually not d-o-t spelled out, but which address is the preferred one, I don't know, but I will let you all know.

CHAIR BERLYN: We will find out, yes. All right. Thank you all. That was a really excellent discussion. All right. We are going to move along now to our breakout rooms. Scott, we are running a little late. We are going to take the breakout still on the dot of two o'clock. Make sure, if you are not meeting in this room, that you are back in this room on the dot of two o'clock.

MR. MARSHALL: Okay. USF and Broadband, please, up the stairs, out this door to my right. Make a right, go up the stairs, and turn right, and two rooms, 438, 468 are adjoining, and I am told they are unlocked and ready for your use.

Consumer folks, right down this

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	hall past the intersecting corridor, and down
2	in that corridor. It is 402, and I believe
3	that is on the right.
4	Disability, of course, is staying
5	here. Again, please speak into the microphone
6	so that we can keep the captioning stream as
7	clear as we can get it.
8	CHAIR BERLYN: We will see you all
9	back here at two o'clock. Thanks.
10	(Whereupon, the foregoing matter
11	went off the record at 1:07 p.m. and resumed
12	at 2:07 p.m.)
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	

# A-F-T-E-R-N-O-O-N S-E-S-S-I-O-N

2:07 p.m.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

CHAIR BERLYN: Welcome back, everybody. I hope your breakout sessions were productive. I know that we have shaved off a little bit of time to accommodate our morning program but, hopefully, you had some good discussions. We will hear about them shortly.

We have couple of items а business to take care of before we get into reports. First all, our of procedural item, and not that we recommendations readopt three that originally passed at our November 4th meeting.

These recommendations are in your packet on plain paper. They are on white paper, and they relate to funding for Public Broadcasting, the Emergency Alert System, and the Lifeline Program. So you see them in your packet.

These were passed and, basically, were out there, but just procedurally because

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	they didn't get into the Federal Register in a
2	timely fashion, we have to reaffirm them.
3	So I could have a motion to
4	readopt these recommendations, from the floor.
5	MR. UMANSKY: I move them the
6	motion.
7	CHAIR BERLYN: And second?
8	MS. CRESPY: Second.
9	CHAIR BERLYN: Any discussion?
LO	Fernando? Discussion, Fernando?
L1	MR. LAGUARDA: Fernando Laguarda,
L2	Time-Warner Cable. I think, procedurally, it
L3	is fine. I would only want to make sure that
L4	the motions as adopted reflect the votes that
L 5	took place. So I believe there were some No
L 6	votes and some Abstentions, as reflected in
L7	the document. Then I have no problem. While
L8	I would vote for these motions, my votes on
L 9	the individual items would stand as they were
20	when we took them.
21	CHAIR BERLYN: Excellent point,
22	Fernando, and Scott assures me that that is

the case. Lise?

MS. HAMLIN: Lise Hamlin here. So that brings to mind a question. I wasn't here for that meeting. Do you want the votes to reflect exactly what they were in the last session? I just wasn't here. I didn't abstain. I just wasn't here.

CHAIR BERLYN: It is unnecessary that you abstain from this vote, because you didn't vote on the last vote. It is fine that you vote to affirm these. Any further discussion?

All those in favor? Any opposed?

Abstaining? Okay, thank you all.

The next item of business is that I would like to send a letter on behalf of the CAC commending Joel Gurin for his outstanding service and commitment to consumers during his time as Bureau Chief of the Consumer and Governmental Affairs Bureau. So that is something that I would like to draft and send on the CAC's behalf.

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	MR. UMANSKY: I will second that.
2	CHAIR BERLYN: Thank you. That is
3	my motion, and it has now been seconded. Any
4	discussion? All those in favor, signify by
5	saying Aye. Any opposed? Any abstaining? I
6	love that, two unanimous votes in a row,
7	Scott. Excellent. Great.
8	All right. Now we are into our
9	reports, and I am going to call on Barry first
10	for a report of the Media Working Group.
11	MR. UMANSKY: Barry Umansky,
12	Digital Policy Institute.
13	As was mentioned earlier, we
14	should Of course, we checked on what the
15	Commission is doing on various
16	recommendations. We will be following through
17	on EAS and Public Broadcasting. They were
18	just now reaffirmed; also, some of the
19	materials that Traci Morris had been advancing
20	on tribal priorities. We want to keep a close
21	look on that.

I have talked with her and I have

talked with Steve about some potential new recommendations for the meeting in June.

Right before we had the breakout sessions, I alluded to something that I personally think, and I have done briefly a consensus that we should have greater focus, I think, as a Consumer Advisory Committee, in urging the FCC and perhaps the Congress as well on the issue of disclosure; because there is nothing that we can do to overturn the Supreme Court.

That is not the way it works, but for years the FCC has had the statutory mandate to make sure that people know who is trying to persuade them in television and radio ads. But I think we have got something larger than just over-the-air broadcasting.

That is why any solution, which I think is long overdue, because we have changed circumstances now. Once or twice, the FCC has pierced the veil and has departed from its standard policy of just looking at who signs

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

the check. That kind of covered it in the old days.

Once or twice, they actually looked to really where the money was coming from when it was so blatant, and these are rules that -- or decisions from about a decade and a half ago.

We have got new changed circumstances. There has been a petition that has been sitting for about 10 months at the FCC, has yet to go on public notice. don't think we necessarily have to say we embrace every element of this petition that was filed by the Media Access Project, but I think it would be a useful point to start the dialogue on what the FCC could do under existing legislation perhaps to reinterpret through its rules what kind of disclosure is necessary when you have these independent ads.

Another track -- and as you recall from our last meeting in November, we had gotten the FCC's General Counsel's Office to

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

concur that, under Section 4(k)(4) of the Communications Act of 1934, the FCC not only has the opportunity but the duty to recommend legislative changes that might better help the agency fulfill its requirements.

I hope that we can all take a look in the next couple of weeks at the contents of H.R. 4010, which is not just restricted to broadcasting. It would extend to all electronic media, and would deal with disclosure of who really is behind these ads.

Our next plenary meeting of the group is going to be -- I think June 15th is the new day. We will have ready by June 15th probably a couple of recommendations that deal with this area. In the meantime, I think we will be informally asking the Commission to at least put that one petition on public notice, again sensitive to the issue of burdens of recordkeeping.

We don't think that they necessarily have to fall on media. We look at

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	the precedent that was set in like disclosure
2	of contraindications of prescription drugs. I
3	think the onus should be on the advertiser for
4	full disclosure.
5	So that is what is coming. I just
6	want to give you a preview of another area
7	where I think both the Media Working Group and
8	the Broadband group and perhaps others, of the
9	myriad rule makings that will starting up as a
10	result of the spectrum related rider to the
11	extension of the payroll tax cut.
12	We will keep a watchful eye on
13	that, and I think that by June probably both
14	working groups will have some recommendations
15	on the FCC's implementation of that
16	Congressional directive. That's it. Any
17	questions? Okay.
18	CHAIR BERLYN: Cecilia has a
19	question.
20	MS. GARCIA: Cecilia Garcia,
21	Benton Foundation. Barry, I wanted to ask if
22	your group at all about the ongoing

discussions around online disclosure for broadcasters, the political files, and that kind of thing?

MR. UMANSKY: That is not. t.he focus of our discussion right now. looking at the disclosure itself and looking at the outlying issue. That is a separate matter. I think, by the time that we meet again, that is probably going to decided by the FCC. I think the intent is to put it on the March or April agenda.

Once we see what the Commission has done, then I think that perhaps the dialogue will be a little more focused.

One other thing that, I'm sorry, I left out. One thing that we would ask Bobby Baker to do, if we were here, to put together some public notices that would, one, explain to consumers what exactly they are seeing and what they are not seeing, but also to explain to all media, not just broadcasting, not just electronic, that there are consequences of

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	airing advertising that contains libelous,
2	untrue material.
3	The protections the broadcasters
4	have when a candidate is running for office,
5	and a candidate's authorized ad is aired, many
6	Supreme Court cases have said that stations
7	are not liable for the content and not liable
8	for libel. But that doesn't exist. There is
9	no such protections for any media when you
LO	have ads by independent groups. That's it.
L1	CHAIR BERLYN: Thanks, Barry.
12	Okay. Now we are going to turn to Cecilia
13	Garcia and the USF Working Group.
L4	MS. GARCIA: Cecilia Garcia,
L5	Benton Foundation. First, I want to thank the
L 6	USF Working Group for a great breakout
L7	session. I think we made some pretty
L8	interesting decisions about the work for the
L9	next couple of months, moving into the June
20	meeting.
21	The very first thing that we want

to report is that we want to change the name

of the Working Group and drop USF as a title and make it Universal Service, because that certainly includes the Fund, the work of Lifeline and the high cost and the fund itself, but also it allows us to look at affordability, which we think for low income consumers is important.

It allows us to take on some things, and we will talk a little bit about that. So that is the first item, and I want to thank the group for pointing that out and kind of rallying around that.

We will have two calls before the June meeting, at least two calls. We may decide to have a third. Our April call, for the working group I will send around a doodle, so that we can figure out the appropriate time, but what we will take up in our next call will be outreach and education around the Lifeline changes.

We think it is very important. As we know, the order really did change things

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

considerably, and as Kim told us this morning, this is an area that they really want the CAC to weigh in on. So we are going to take that up in our next meeting.

What we would like to do, and I will talk to Debra and Scott abut this after our meeting, we would like the FCC staffer who can join us for that call to talk about outreach. We would like them to come prepared to discuss with us what materials are being prepared, what is the timeline, and what process can we create together to ensure our input and to make sure that we can provide some good feedback for them.

So we can talk about who that person should be and when we can have the call. So that is the very next thing.

Our May call -- That was our first call. That would be our April call. Then the next call: One of the reasons that we wanted to make the change in the name is so that we can really look at this issue of prison phones

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

that Amalia brought up.

There is a lot of activity going on at the grassroots level around this issue. We are positioned well, we think, to be able to bring these concerns to the FCC so that the FCC then can weigh in. So we would like to do that.

Another part of that call will be a briefing on the survey that Amalia talked about from Action United on the experiences of low income consumers in Philadelphia around signing up for the Internet Essentials Program for Comcast. So we will get a briefing on that as well during that call.

I think that's it. That is it for our activities heading into the next meeting.

Do you also want me to talk about the recommendation?

CHAIR BERLYN: Yes. We will turn to that in a minute. Does anyone from the Universal Service Working Group have anything else to add, any other thoughts?

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

MS. DELONEY: We love our group.

Everyone take out one of your two pink pieces of paper in your folder here. It is the recommendation regarding the Remote Areas Fund that you will see. This is the Working Group recommendation that Cecilia is going to now present.

MS. GARCIA: Basically, this recommendation has two points. The first is to -- What we are asking is that the Remote Areas Fund be structured in such a way that it enables the municipal community and local broadband providers to participate in the fund.

The reason for that is we believe that community based entities are able to reach deeper within communities. That is really the reason for the first part of this recommendation. It is to acknowledge the work that is done at the community level, and we just feel that there is a lot to be gained,

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

that a lot of community engagement, true community engagement, and feedback that can happen if this opportunity is made available to these entities. So that is the first part.

The second is an interconnection obligation. Basically, what this part of the recommendation assures is that that last mile of connectivity is assured in rural areas. That is basically the essence of that second recommendation there.

As we know, in rural areas that last mile is usually the hardest of the connections to make, and this would give the back haul capacity to communities so that they can have that connectivity in an easier fashion. So that is the essence of our recommendation.

If I have misspoke or if there is something that my colleagues want to add to that, please feel free to raise your hand and add. I want to thank Amalia for helping me understand that second part a little better.

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	CHAIR BERLYN: Does someone make a
2	motion to move Oh, we will have discussion
3	after Someone make a motion to move the
4	recommendation?
5	MR. McELDOWNEY: I will.
6	CHAIR BERLYN: And second?
7	MS. MARTINEZ: Second.
8	CHAIR BERLYN: Discussion.
9	Questions and discussion? Chris, and then
10	Paul. Chris, raise your hand and identify
11	yourself.
12	MR. BAKER: Chris Baker, AARP. A
13	minor point: In the first bullet, you
14	mentioned to assure that consumers have access
15	to the most robust available broadband
16	service. Do we want to put affordable in
17	there? I don't see a mention of affordable.
18	MS. GARCIA: Absolutely. That
19	would be fine with me. Sure.
20	CHAIR BERLYN: No objections.
21	Paul?
22	MR. SCHROEDER: Paul Schroeder,

1	American Foundation for the Blind. It
2	shouldn't need to be said, but I think it
3	probably does. I would love to see if we
4	could add something along the lines of "ensure
5	that these groups will do outreach and work
6	with the disability community" or "efforts to
7	ensure that people with disabilities have
8	access," something along those lines.
9	Otherwise, I fear, like the Lifeline
10	discussion, it will be lost in the cracks.
11	MS. GARCIA: Paul, I think that is
12	a wonderful suggestion, and I would appreciate
13	if maybe you could help me with some language
14	to insert, and I think that would be good.
15	MR. SCHROEDER: Okay.
16	CHAIR BERLYN: Perhaps, Paul, if
17	you could draft something in the next half-
18	hour or so that you can give to Cecilia, and
19	we will come back to this and vote on it in
20	the next half-hour or so, that would be great.
21	Does anyone else have any other

comments, edits, questions? Mitsy?

1	MS. HERRERA: In the second bullet
2	point, the interconnection obligation Is
3	that an interconnection obligation to each
4	other?
5	MS. GARCIA: The obligation would
6	be on the providers who receive support from
7	the fund.
8	MS. HERRERA: They are
9	interconnecting to what?
10	MS. GARCIA: It would be to
11	provide the last mile, the connectivity
12	They would be providing the mechanism whereby
13	communities can then make the connection in
14	the last mile, the last two homes and
15	businesses.
16	CHAIR BERLYN: Does that answer
17	your question, Mitsy?
18	MS. HERRERA: I understand the
19	first bullet point. I am just trying to
20	understand the second one. Are you saying
21	that, where you have other last mile providers
22	that the incumbent has an obligation to

1	interconnect with them?
2	MS. GARCIA: Yes.
3	MS. HERRERA: Okay.
4	CHAIR BERLYN: Okay. Any other
5	questions right now? If not, Cecilia, Paul
6	will work with you on incorporating that
7	language, and we will get back to you after
8	the other working group reports.
9	Ed, the Consumer Empowerment
10	Working Group.
11	MR. BARTHOLME: Ed Bartholme with
12	Call for Action.
13	Since the November meeting, our
14	group had been focusing pretty heavily on the
15	NOI concerning harmonization of the TCPA and
16	TSR rules. We had actually begun to draft a
17	recommendation concerning that, and then I
18	guess the Commission caught wind, and out of
19	fear of our impending recommendation decided
20	to add it to their agenda and preemptively
21	strike on us, so that we couldn't get a

recommendation out.

So we decided to table it and wait and see what the outcome of their discussion was concerning this topic. The outcome was in line with what we were going to recommend that they do. So we see that as being a good thing.

A little bit earlier, we had some further discussion on the topic, and are going to plan to recommend moving forward. We are going to put out a recommendation that both supports the decision that was made, acknowledges that we feel that that was the right way to go with it, but we also feel that, while it is nice to harmonize the rules, what is really lacking here is the enforcement side of things concerning TCPA violations.

In looking at the complaints that are logged, the TCPA related complaints have grown exponentially over the past few years, and until they actually start to go after the bad actors in this arena, it is not going to stop, and it is not going to change.

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

So while it is great that this was a very positive outcome in that the rules are now the same, until they actually start to enforce the rules, consumers and end going users are not to see any real improvement in their situation or their frustration level.

So that is what we are going to carry forward as the next step, and this is for stuff like the unwanted text messages you get on your phone or marketing calls where it is really not the carrier's fault, and the carrier has very little they can actually do about it.

There needs to be enforcement action taken against the initiators, whether it is a robocall company or a marketing firm or whoever is on the back end sending out these blasts of text messages and phone calls. So that is something that we are planning on looking at and having a recommendation for at the June meeting.

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

We also had been discussing heavily the website. We did look at whether wise it would be to make or not recommendation concerning the website, and the majority of the group felt that it would be better to hear from someone from the FCC as to what they see as the audience, where they gauge their own progress on the site before we put forth any sort of recommendation.

That was intended to happen today, but unfortunately, plans didn't jive with that, and it has to be pushed back. So we are going to have a working group phone call at the very least. We discussed the possibility of maybe even having a webinar or some sort of web conference where the person can walk us through different parts of the website, if that is necessary, some us some of the things or show us some future things potentially that they are working on.

Because that is of interest to so many other groups, aside from just the

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Consumer Empowerment Group, I will send out an email to the entire plen, with any notice of when we are going to have that phone call, when that person would be available, and any other information related to that. So please don't think I am Spamming you. I am just trying to keep you in the loop as to what is going on with that.

Hopefully, we will get some good information and like what we are hearing, and maybe have a recommendation that supports their future endeavors at the next meeting. If not, we would probably be in favor of making a recommendation expressing some concerns with the direction that it has taken or this current state, and maybe offering up some possible improvement suggestions, just depending on how that dialogue goes.

So that is something else that is on our radar as a working group.

We also talked a little bit about some of the issues that deal with marketing in

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

underserved communities or minority communities where there are certain scams that seem to run rampant through those areas, that prey on language differences and those sorts of things. That might be something we look at as a group moving forward.

Another thing that we talked about was the possibility of sharing greater consumer input and consumer group feedback with the consumer protection group here at the FCC. We were very encouraged by Bill's comments this morning. We look forward to having him back at a future meeting.

We briefly dialogued about the possibility of doing something similar to what the FTC does with their Consumer Sentinel where they allow outside groups to provide data into that system of what they are seeing, so that that way there is a greater aggregate total.

We also talked about maybe having the possibility for more direct dialogue and

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

interaction between some of the consumer groups with some people here at the Commission as to what we are seeing as problems, and is it unique to us? Is it unique to a certain area or is this something that is on their radar as well, and what, if anything, can we do about that?

We are not sure if that is best suited for the CAC as a whole or if that should be maybe a separate outreach effort between the Consumer Protection Group and Consumer Empowerment Group here and various members of the plan and other consumer focused organizations out there.

That's where we are at.

CHAIR BERLYN: Interesting.

Thanks, Ed. Does anyone have any questions for Ed? I would just like to say on the question of the website, because we talked a lot about it on one call that I was on, but I missed, I think, the subsequent conversation.

There were questions about who was

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

having issues with the website. Many of us who use the website are not your typical consumers who are going on the FCC's website. So I think that was one thing that we were sort of grappling with.

Out an article or something that the American Bar Association had written about how the newly designed website was not working, and that raised some concerns. But, of course, the American Bar Association was offering it from the point of view of regulatory attorneys who are using this website to participate in the filing process at the FCC. So that is not whose interests we are representing.

We are representing consumers who want to participate in the process at the FCC. So we felt like we had to look at this a little bit more closely from the perspective of the consumers who would be getting information, filing complaints, and wanting to participate and get their views heard at the

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

FCC. So what is the best website for them, and how do you best get information about the FCC.

One of the questions we had, which we haven't gotten an answer to, is for those of you who use the FCC's new website, it is very interesting that the first thing that you can do is click that little button that says previous fcc.gov.

On our call, we discovered that just about all of us do that right away, that we immediately go to the old website and use all of the features that the old website has. I don't know if that is force of habit or it is just more easily laid out. We haven't quite figured that out yet. We wonder how long we are going to still be able to use that, those of us that use that.

Those are some of the questions that we were grappling with, with the website, and we are anxious to talk to someone at the FCC about that, so that we can start this

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

process of trying to figure it out and figure it out for the consumer population that is trying to make the best use of the website.

MR. BARTHOLME: To tag along with that, some of the stuff we addressed is who is the actual audience of this website.

CHAIR BERLYN: Right.

MR. BARTHOLME: Is it groups like ours who frequently go there and look for proposed rule makings and stuff like that, or is it more of a consumer education/consumer empowerment portal, and does that work better? Are we missing the point, so to speak, on that, because we have the habit of going to where we know where to find things, whereas consumers who come there for the first time, this is the best thing going for them, and we just don't see it that way, because we are kind of looking at it through a different perspective.

So do they have any sort of research they have done or are they looking at

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

focus groups and getting feedback on what they have put out there, and do they know it works and we just don't see it, which could very well be the case.

CHAIR BERLYN: Right.

MR. BARTHOLME: So that is something that we are anxious to hear back from them.

If I could add, one of the things that I am going to send out to the group is I would like any feedback or concerns that you have with the website. So just, if you could start to look at the new website, not click through to the old website, but spend a little time on the new website and just kind of play around a little bit, and see.

Kind of just make some notes about what you think works or what you think doesn't work, and we will try to get a list together so that it is not just a barrage of questions when we finally do get somebody on the phone.

We would like to give them a heads up about

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

some of the things that we want to address. 1 2 CHAIR BERLYN: Yes. One piece of feedback that you might all look at, too, is 3 4 how the Consumer Advisory Committee is laid out on the new website as well, because I know 5 6 some of us who are concerned about how more 7 difficult it is to actually find that on the new website. So that might be helpful. 8 9 Ιf any of you have actual 10 consumers who are kind of new users who might go to the FCC's website and have insight into 11 how it is to use the FCC website for the first 12 13 time, I think that would really be helpful. That kind of feedback would be great as well. 14 15 other questions for Any Ed? 16 Thanks, Ed. Broadband Working Group. Chris and Mark? 17 MR. DEFALCO: Hi. Mark Defalco ad 18

MR. DEFALCO: Hi. Mark Defalco ad the Appalachian Regional Commission. Since the last time we have met, we have had three or four calls. They have been very lively, a lot of discussion, a lot of good discussion.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

19

20

21

It did result in the recommendation from the Working Group to the Committee, and Crystal will go through that, I think, in just a minute. We are still concentrating on broadband adoption. We think that is probably the area where we could best serve the interests of the Commission.

I would like to thank Mary Crespy for all the work she did in compiling some lists of all the recommendations coming out of the National Broadband Plan, and then voting that we all put together on trying to highlight areas where we thought would be the most constructive for our attention, and she really put a lot of work into that. So I want to publicly thank her for doing all of that.

We acknowledge the value that partnership groups have in working toward broadband solutions. With that in mind, going forward, we are going to pursue discussions, hopefully, leading to recommendations for adoption efforts for other at risk groups such

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

as older Americans, perhaps some disadvantaged minority groups, areas where we think that perhaps partnerships could be put together to try to assist in the adoption efforts.

Then we are going to continue to monitor other adoption activities that are currently underway by various groups, and just make sure we have a thorough understanding of what they are doing, how they are doing it, and how it may or may not tie in with other activities that have taken place at the state level or through other government agencies.

Then we are also going to, I think, pursue some discussions on the use of unlicensed spectrum in working toward broadband spectrum issues.

So that is pretty much where we are. I certainly encourage any of the Group members to jump in with thoughts or comments or concerns.

CHAIR BERLYN: Does anyone else on the Broadband Working Group have any input

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

into the discussion points? Any questions for Mark before we turn to the recommendations that the Working Group has? Okay, your other pink sheet. Mark or Chris, who is going to present this? Okay, Chris.

MR. BAKER: Hello. Chris Baker,
AARP. We think this recommendation really
goes to the heart, the essence, of what the
Working Group's responsibilities are, and that
National Broadband Plan was a 10-year
strategy goal that was approved almost two
years ago, and lays out an ambitious plan.

Part of it was the recognition, understanding, by the FCC that, be successful, they need to measure the progress and report back to the public on what is They specifically mentioned the happening. broadband.gov website as a good way to do that, and used that very effectively the first year or SO of the plan. But this recommendation encourages the FCC to continue to use that and to, as bullet one -- the first

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1 bullet says, to make plans available year by 2 year of what are the priorities for the FCC's 3 work for that year. 4 Then, number two, to track the recommendations. Where are we? How far along 5 6 are we, and to update frequently so that 7 people know, can follow the progress. Some of this is updated on different parts of the 8 9 fcc.gov website or in reports that are issued, 10 but having it all in one place on a website named broadband.gov, I think, would help focus 11 attention on it and have people understand 12 13 what is going on. Then finally, as was mentioned in 14 15 the Broadband Plan, to track the six goals of 16 the plan and see where we are in meeting those would be an important way to understand the 17 success of the plan. Any questions? 18 19 CHAIR BERLYN: Would someone move 20 the recommendation? MR. LAGUARDA: So moved. 21

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

CHAIR BERLYN: And second?

1	MS. GARCIA: Second.
2	CHAIR BERLYN: And second. Any
3	questions or discussion on the recommendation?
4	Sounds like you have done a good job,
5	Broadband Working Group. We can move the
6	question.
7	All those in favor of the
8	recommendation, signify by saying Aye. Any
9	opposed? Any abstaining? I'm sorry, is that
LO	an abstention? I see one abstention. Any
L1	others? I apologize. Scott, I did forget
L2	that people on the phone cannot respond. Is
L3	that right? We have to stop?
L4	MR. MARSHALL: I should check on
L5	that other vote, just to make sure that we
16	didn't have any. Well, okay. Let me stop
L7	then and ask: On the phone
L8	MR. MARSHALL: I'm sorry. Who
L9	abstained?
20	CHAIR BERLYN: Krista for CTIA
21	abstained.
22	MR. MARSHALL: I just wanted to

1	get that on the record.
2	CHAIR BERLYN: Everyone else was a
3	yes, and there were no no votes.
4	Is there anyone else on the phone
5	who wishes to cast a vote?
6	MR. LEWIS: This is Clayton. I
7	voted Aye.
8	CHAIR BERLYN: Okay. Great, thank
9	you. Thanks, Chris, and thanks, Mark.
LO	All right. Now we have the
L1	Disability Working Group report. Lise or
L2	Paul?
L3	MR. SCHROEDER: Paul Schroeder. I
L 4	think we drew straws and arm wrestled, and I
L 5	got tangled into it.
L 6	We talked about a number of
L7	topics, and I just want to mention a couple
L 8	that I think are ones that we are going to
L 9	continue to work on, just so you are aware of
20	it.
21	Actually, a new one that came up
22	today and might even have relevance to others

in this room -- I don't know, but that was the issue of consumer comment and feedback on rule making at the FCC. The sort of the sum was that it is a rather daunting and legalistic process, particularly for consumers who are not necessarily able to use the resources of an organization in order to put in their comments.

I think several of the Disability Group members agreed that we would like to see if we can propose models or other ideas, recognizing that the FCC, and particularly the DRO, has worked very hard to try to gather consumer input and to ensure that consumers are heard in rule making, particularly around disability issues, though input on any number of rules would be relevant.

The point remains that the FCC, perhaps more than most other Federal agencies with which consumers, at least consumers with disabilities, come into contact, is an offputting process, and I think a lot of

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

people are scared that, when they do submit comments, if they don't have all of the headings and report and orders and rule makings exactly right, that their comments won't be heard and won't be germane.

So that is something that, I think, we will certainly take a look at and, as I said, it may have relevance even to other groups. I don't know if others have heard similar concerns from consumers about entering into providing feedback on rule making at this agency.

is possibly a There of set comments to come back on video relay service, not so much -- There is rule making in place now, but we may entertain comments about the itself, structure and SO those would something, if it is deemed relevant by the Work Group over the next few months, we will bring back to consider for June agenda.

We discussed the clearinghouse on products that has been set up pursuant to the

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Communications and Video Accessibility Act, and we didn't have anyone from DRO to address that with us, but we did have a conversation about ways in which we could be providing feedback on the clearinghouse, and also giving guidance on steps that need to be taken.

There were a number of topics that we did not get to, and there are still some topics on our agenda. I think we are going to have to get back to doing much more work as a Work Group during these interim months before June.

I will ask Lise if she wants to add anything initially.

MS. HAMLIN: This is Lise Hamlin.

The only other thing that -- I don't know, I think my access is cutting out. I can't hear myself.

The only other thing I wanted to bring up is that we discussed -- There were some issues related to caption quality and people who are deaf-blind, which goes back to

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

CVAA. We were -- Actually, when we set up this committee, we were told that we should stay away from CVAA issues, because there are two other advisory bodies that are working on that. But now they are closing.

VPAAC is closing up. EAAC is

still active, so emergency issues. So I want to bring the question up: Now that VPAAC is closing up, if we can address some of the issues that have been left out or not addressed?

MR. MARSHALL: This is Scott. I believe that was the intention, Lise, that once the statutorily created Advisory Committees ceased, that we could again pick up these issues, as we had done in the past.

MR. HAMLIN: Thank you, and I think we will probably want to do that then. I would ask any other members of the committee if they have anything to add to what we brought? I think Paul did a great job summarizing it. So thank you, and multi-

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

tasking at the same time, and providing more comments. Very impressed.

CHAIR BERLYN: Anyone have any questions of the Disability Working Group? Ed?

MR. BARTHOLME: This is not really a question, but kind of a comment, and maybe I am completely making this up. But I thought I remembered when one of the first visits Joel had here and talking about the transition to the new website and new outreach efforts, I thought there was some mention of the fact that they were going to have like Tweeting and discussion posts that they planned on then including in the public record as it pertains to certain things.

I just wonder if that is another filing outside of the formal avenue for process of -- and the burden and the effort into actually filing goes а comment, if that is another way participation, maybe the follow-up and

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

question to that would be to go back to the Commission and say, how do you guys incorporate tweets and discussion posts into what you do? Do you weigh those the same as you weigh formal comments that are filed, and that sort of thing.

CHAIR BERLYN: So maybe someone else can help me out here, but I know during the open Internet proceeding, there was a way of just going on that and just writing a comment, a one-line, two-line comment, and it went right into the record, and they got thousands of comments that way.

So I don't know. Did they do that on every -- Do you know, Scott? Do they do that on every proceeding now or is it just certain proceedings?

MR. MARSHALL: This is Scott. I don't know the answer to that precise question about whether it is available on every proceeding. I do know that the Office of General Counsel did look at this matter and

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	how it worked with the Administrative
2	Procedure Act, and that when the new blogging
3	system was developed, the whole idea was that
4	people would be able to make comments and that
5	the comments would be incorporated into a
6	particular docket through the website in that
7	fashion.
8	Beyond that, I don't know more
9	about it, but we can certainly inquire further
10	and let you know.
11	CHAIR BERLYN: Good question,
12	though, really good point. Back to our
13	Universal Service Working Group and Cecilia's
14	recommendation. Do you have new language for
15	us?

MS. GARCIA: Yes. Thank you to Paul for giving us this language. This would be added -- This sentence would be added to the second paragraph of the recommendation, and the sentence reads: "The CAC further encourages the Commission to ensure that these municipal, community, and local broadband

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	providers ensure that their broadband services
2	address the needs of, and are accessible to,
3	people with disabilities."
4	CHAIR BERLYN: One more reading.
5	This is at the last sentence of the second
6	paragraph?
7	MS. GARCIA: That is correct.
8	"The CAC further encourages the Commission to
9	ensure that these municipal, community, and
LO	local broadband providers ensure that their
11	broadband services address the needs of, and
12	are accessible to, people with disabilities."
13	CHAIR BERLYN: Someone want to
L4	move the amendment?
15	MR. SCHROEDER: I will move it.
16	CHAIR BERLYN: Okay. Second?
L7	MR. UMANSKY: Second.
18	CHAIR BERLYN: And now discussion
L9	on the amendment? Hearing no discussion, we
20	now will take a vote on the amendment to the
21	recommendation. All those in favor, say Aye.
22	Any opposed? Any abstaining? Now this is on

1	the amendment. This is just on the amendment.
2	I have one abstention, Krista from CTIA.
3	Now we need to take a vote on the
4	recommendation itself. So on the
5	recommendation as amendment, all those in
6	favor, signify by saying Aye. Anyone opposed?
7	And abstaining?
8	Now abstaining, Scott, we have
9	Fernando, Time-Warner, Julie, CEA, Steven
10	Pociask, Krista, and Rick. Those are all
11	abstentions. Oh, and T-Mobile. I'm sorry.
12	Two abstentions then, on the amendment and
13	then also T-Mobile on the final. Did I catch
14	all the abstentions?
15	MR. MARSHALL: Did we get
16	everybody?
17	CHAIR BERLYN: I think so.
18	Excellent. Thank you. Thank you, Cecilia.
19	So that concludes all of our
20	working group reports and all our
21	recommendations. Thank you, everyone for all
22	your hard work. You all have been meeting

1	regularly, and doing great work. So thank you
2	all for all your upcoming plans as well.
3	We are now at that point from
4	comments from the public. Is there anyone who
5	has a comment? I don't think we have any
6	tweets to respond to. Is that right, Scott?
7	Well, we are going to work on that for our
8	next meeting. There is one in our packet?
9	There is something in the packet?
10	MR. MARSHALL: It is a comment
11	from someone who emailed me, and it is just
12	for information only.
13	CHAIR BERLYN: For information
14	only. Okay. Mitsy?
15	MS. HERRERA: Yes, just two quick
16	things. Just on that comment, it does ask for
17	a status update on the AllVid proceeding. Can
18	we get that on the next agenda?
19	The other is a sort of
20	housekeeping detail. I notice that, when we
21	schedule the Bureau staff to come, there are
22	relatively small periods, and we have

questions, and we sort of always run late. So maybe we could schedule them for longer periods.

CHAIR BERLYN: Yes. I think that is a good recommendation. We will work on our scheduling cluster time. Based on today, I think we already have an agenda for June.

MR. MARSHALL: Yes, I think so.

CHAIR BERLYN: Sounds like we have already got June's agenda set, and we definitely will see if we can line up Bill Freedman for a one-on-one, because we had so much to talk to him about as well.

So wrap up --

MR. MARSHALL: Can I respond to Mitsy's other question about the status issue? I did respond to this consumer, Mitsy -- this is Scott Marshall -- and said that I would try to find out, if I could, any information about this, although usually on matters of timing and when the Commission is going to act on something, that information is pretty much

1	made public when it is made public, and I
2	would not have any advance notice of that
3	anymore than anyone else would.
4	MS. HERRERA: When I talked
5	earlier about the video issues, that at the
6	NCA meeting last year or actually, I take
7	it back. At a year ago January, they sort of
8	had announced this would come out. It is an
9	issue that is a big deal for consumers,
10	because it does address their ability to get
11	around paying for rentals of set-top boxes.
12	So I understand that maybe if
13	there could at least be a status update I
14	understand, it is difficult to predict
15	deadlines, but at least sort of where this
16	stands and what are sort of the remaining
17	issues that the Commission is grappling with.
18	MR. MARSHALL: I will make the
19	inquiry.
20	CHAIR BERLYN: Okay. Just in the
21	next couple of minutes, just a couple of
22	announcements. We have a date for our next

1	CAC meeting, June 15th.
2	Thank you all. We seem to all
3	Scott, you know it is about one minute to
4	three. So we are at our adjournment time.
5	Somehow we did that. But we will figure out
6	our schedule next time, so we don't cram our
7	speakers so closely together, but I am glad we
8	had time to have some good issue discussions
9	as well as a group.
10	I look forward to seeing you agair
11	in June, and thanks for all your hard work.
12	Motion to adjourn?
13	MR. LAGUARDA: So move.
14	MR. McELDOWNEY: Second.
15	CHAIR BERLYN: All those in favor?
16	See you in June. Thanks, all.
17	(Whereupon, the foregoing matter
18	went off the record at 2:59 p.m.)
19	
20	